

THE POWER  
OF  
THE KEYES:  
OR, OF  
*BINDING and LOOSING.*

---

1 COR. II. 31.

*Et lauro dignetur in se impetare.*

---



---

LONDON,  
Printed for *Richard Royston*, at the  
Angel in *Iwic-lane*, 1651.





## The Preface.

**H**ad the prince *all* of Power enstated by Christ on his Apostles, as for the governing of the Church, (and exorcising or banishing all devils out of it) so for the effectual performing that great *all* of Charity to *more* souls, reducing pertinacious sinners to repentance, should be so either wholly dilapidated, or pitiously deformed, as to continue in the Church only, under one of these two notions, either of an empty piece of formality, or of an engine of State, and secular contrivance, (the true Christian use of shaming sinners into reformation, being well-nigh vanished out of Christendom) might by an alien, or an heathen, much more by the pondering Christian, be conceived very strange and unreasonable; were it not a title clear, that we live in a state into those times of which it was foretold by two Apostles, that in these last dayes, there should come scoffers, walking after their own lusts: the Pride and contumacy (which have almost become the Genius) of this prophane polluted age, brightning men to an Atheistical fearless scoffing and scorning of all that pretends to work any cures, to lay any restraint on them, to rob them of any degree of that licentiousness, which is become the very religion, and doctrine of some (under the disguise of Christian liberty) and (the Lord be merciful

## THE PREFACE.

ful unto us the practise of most ranges of Christian Professors. This is the more sad & mounding a consideration, because it was antiently resolved, that Christianity where ever it entered in its purity, did plant all manner of exact and strict conscientious walking, all humility, meeknes, purity, peaceableness, justice, charity, sobriety, imaginable; that wickednes and dissolution of manners was to be lookt on as the only heresie, (and therefore Simon Magus, the Nicolaitans, and Gnosticks, with other their nearest followers, that led the Van of hereticks in Epiphanius, are notoriously known to have been persons of the most vicious, debauched, libidinous lives) and good life reserved as the only orthodox profession from whence (as nothing can be more consequent, so) I shall designe to inferre no farther conclusion, then duly this, that they which live ill in the profession of a most holy faith, (or farther then so, embrace and disseminate doctrines which tend to the dissolution of mens lives, making the good spirit of God the author or cherisher of any of their unchristian enterprises) but especially they that discharge and banish out of the Church those means which might help to waite the generality of Christians better, have the spirit of Antichrist working in them, even when they think themselves most zealously busied in the beating down his kingdom. What those means are which might most effectually tend to the amending the lives of Christians, I shal need no farther to interpose my judgement; then 1. by submitting it to Christs, who put the Keyes into the Apostles hands, on purpose as a means to exemplifie the end of his coming, & as to towards, Acts 10. 11. to save that which was lost, not to usurpe authority over the temporal power or sword, and like an apostolick pulse, sit in the seat of power, to invade, or smite, or dissolution

dissolve the sinews of civil government or peace (the a most  
 sacred truth, that the spiritual had but no manner of ju-  
 risdiction, nor was ever believed to have for the first 1000  
 years, over Princes in their temporals, and the composition  
 of the Anglican Church most perfectly, I had almost said,  
 peculiarly acknowledges it) nor again to give an office of  
 splendor or grandeur to the Clergie, an authority valuable  
 onely from the ability of hurting others, or magnifying our  
 selves over them, (which where it is pretended to, is indeed  
 somewhat of the making of the heathen *dixoris* and *narra-  
 uenditoris*, that larded it over Gods heritage, served them-  
 selves, either their purses, or their ambitions, or their pas-  
 sions out of the subjects under them) but as Christ saith,  
*diakonoi, & diakonissai*, to administer charitably to them in  
 the matters of the highest alloy, the divinest, valuablest  
 charity of not suffering sin upon the brother, *Levit. 19. And*  
*2.* by winding my self and others, what the Apostles say of  
 this power, that it was given them *rescindendo*, to build up  
 the Church of Christ by it in general, and in particular  
*uadendo*, to discipline them, whom no fairer means would  
 work on, and teach them not to blaspheme in words or  
 actions, to work them off from all foes of speculation, but  
 especially of practical Atheisme. That these are the not  
 weak or carnal weapons of the Churches warfare, but  
 mighty to bring down every strong hold (i.e. the most con-  
 tumacious, stout, importunate sinner, that doth but acknow-  
 ledge the truth of the Gospel, I shall anon have leisure to  
 shew you. In the mean, the only design of this *Prælogium*  
 is, to awaken (if it be possible) the drowse world, and quick-  
 en them so far from the mortified, petrified state of *stupiditas*  
 and stupidity, as to be willing but to hearken to Christ him-  
 self, when he comes but on a message of mercy to them, to re-

Tim. 2. 14.

deem them from iniquity, and purifie to himself a pos-  
 sessed purchased people (or the people which he had pur-  
 chased for that end, that they might be) zealous of  
 good works. If this general proposal, (so pertinaciously de-  
 cried by our actions) might once be thought worth the hear-  
 ing, then sure Christs peculiar way and method of work-  
 ing this cure, would be thought of some use and advantage  
 also; not look on as a meer engine, or artifice of ambiti-  
 ous men, as they cannot be blamed to conceive it, who  
 think it doth any way entrench on those regalities which  
 are placed by God, I most willingly professe to believe, far  
 above the reach of any humane authority, solo Deo mi-  
 nores; or else suppose it a tyrannizing, or triumphing o-  
 ver the most inferiour offender, (he that can take any car-  
 nal or sensual pleasure in the exercise of those Keyes, in  
 the using that sharp engine of surgery, or ever draw it  
 but in meer necessary charity, (to edification, and not to  
 destruction) is one of the צדק sonnes of blood; not  
 fit to be admitted on a common lury, much lesse advanced  
 to be a spiritual Iudge) but as a most soveraigne medici-  
 nal Recipe, that which hath the inscription of Christ on  
 it; not as of a Lord, but as a Iesus; not as a Law-giver,  
 but as a gentle & iust, a Saviour and a Physitian of souls.  
 And this peculiar way is the power of binding and loo-  
 sing, (the subject of this ensuing Discourse) which that it  
 may be restored to its full vigor in this Church again, and  
 (where ever sobriety shall advise) by addition of peni-  
 tential Canons be reformed or regulated, and being put  
 into the primitive Channel, may there be permitted to  
 shew forth it self in the native purity and brightnesse, and  
 so being ordered according to Gods designation, obtain  
 Gods blessing to make it effectual to its end, (the almost  
 only

only place of reformation which this Church is at present  
as it hath been long, and as yet stands establishing by Law  
may justly be thought to stand in need of. I shall be the  
prayer of him, who professes to love and admire the beau-  
ty of this Fabrick, even when it lies polluted in its blood,  
and to wish no greater blessing to its dearest Friends, or  
for whom he daily prays, most implacable Enemies, then  
(that of old Barntinus for himself, Lord that they may  
receive their sight) that the scales may fall off from all  
our eyes, that we may see and value what is so illustriously  
conspicuous, and estimable in it self, and not so blear our  
sight with the observation of the miscarriages in this kind  
as not to discern or value the designation; which if the  
abuses, and excesses, and mistakes (that have crept in in  
that matter) were timely discerned, and removed, and  
that which is Christian and Apostolical revived, and  
restored in prudence and sobriety, might yet again show the  
world the use of that Prelacy, which is now so zealously  
contemned, and recover at once the Order and the Es-  
timation of it, set more Saints on their knees in pe-  
titions for reducing and restoring, then ever employed  
their hands toward the suppressing of it. I shall no longer  
need to detain the Reader in his entrance, having no use  
of any popular topick to court, or get advantage on his  
affections, but desiring only to treat with his reason (as that  
is elevated by Christ) his more noble masculine faculty, and  
1. From the institution of Christ, to shew him the benefit  
that will accrew to that better part of him, by consigning  
within subjection to his government: and 2. By the peculi-  
arity of the Fabrick of this excellent (yet establish) Church  
of England, to challenge the most sharp-sighted opposition  
to shew where the due execution of this power according to  
Law



## THE PREFACE.

Lawful from him to anything but charity and gratitude, but to the favour that designed, and to the Prelate that is his Angel in conveying this reasonable mercy to him; and more generally, where, or in what point of conjunction, or motion, it can any way interfere, or disturb the civil interest. It bick it would be hard to affirm of any other national Church in Europe, which hath any power either of repressing hereticks, or of reforming, or but of shaming notorious offenders, left in it. The Lord grant us unprejudicate honest hearts to judge uprightly of it, and every one of us, that would ~~unwarlike~~ precious ornament, 1 Pet. 3. 4. (in stead of that ~~warlike~~ ~~warlike~~, that bravery of hell in Macarius, that the proud is so well pleased with) I mean that meeknesse and quietnesse of spirit, to think some others may possibly discern betwixt good and evil, as well as our selves; and when that prayer is once heard, I shall then suppose that willow that hath given Themistocles the victory or preheminence over his fellows in the judgement of all posterity, (viz. that every man named him next after himself) will certainly end the present Church-controvercie of these sad times. A moderate Episcopacy, with a standing assistant Presbytery, and a ~~number~~ of those assigned his full task and province of employment also) being the onely fourth, which as it will certainly satisfy the desires of those whose pretensions are regular and moderate, (having by their study of learning & Christianity attained to some measure of that grace which Aristonymus of old recites amonge the benefits of Philosophy, ~~βούλει ἀνελκύναι τὴν ψαῖον, ἢ ἀνελκύναι τὴν ἀνδρείαν~~) craving nothing more, and in many things lesse then the standing Law of the Land allow them, so will it appear to be that which all other parties can best tolerate, and which

next

\* Vid. Con. of  
present use con-  
cern change of  
Church-gover-  
pag. 16.

## THE PREFACE

next himself, both Presbyterian and Independent, and Erastian will make no question to buy and prefer before any of the other pretenders.

This, I conceive, is not by any ministerially dictated, but already demonstrated aposteriori by the experience which the few last months have yielded us, since the pretensions of the Prelacy grew weaker, and of the other three more flattering and hopeful one against the other. Where in every turn of the trembling notion that which hath seemed most to be supplanted by either of the other pretenders, hath been content to acknowledge, that their cost and industry in the eradication of Prelacy, is not likely to be rewarded in this life, but with surer pressures, or more dangerous looseness, than that which formerly they had mount-  
ed under. And for a demonstration a priori, I suppose it sufficient, if it be but calmly considered, that the several excellencies of the other three, by which they set themselves out, and which will doubtless hold them in our favour, (the Presbyterians sharpness and severity against all ignorance and sin, the Independents zeal against mixt Congregations, and the Erastians care that the civil power may not be entrencht on, and that they that might receive benefit by the Word and Sacrament, should by no means be interdicted the use of them) may all and each of them be found (at least, as in mixture, refracted &c) compounded in this fourth: Which to shew particularly, would require a length beyond the bounds of this Preface, and on that civility to the Reader, it is now omitted, as also that I may not seem to have mistaken the point of the present controversie; which certainly among the quickest sharpest designers, or managers of it, is not, what are the uses and excellencies of this power, but what the properest seat, who the fittest to be intrusted with it.

One



# THE PREFACE.

One thing yet more there is, which in this matter well  
deserve to be considered, viz. the Conscience of Our So-  
vereigne, in order both to our common duty to Him, and  
to an honourable and durable peace, toward which how  
near soever we conceive our selves advanced by provi-  
dence, we cannot reasonably expect the sure blessing of  
God, to consummate and crown our hopes, if we doe not  
acquiesce as we say, in the Apostles phrase, i. e. use all the  
expedients, that any ambitious man would employ to the  
attaining his worldly designe, I mean, all that prudence  
will suggest, and (uber) Christian conscience not reject to  
the making up a happy compliance with him, in a word,  
if we do not by all moderate lawfull means love and  
follow peace, and consider them who have the le-  
gal power over us.

**O** that wee would know, at least in this our day,  
the things belonging to our peace, before that  
fatal voice goe out, But now are they hid from  
your eyes.

Of this I have written the point of the peace  
controversie; which certainly among the wisest and  
deliberatest managers of it, is not what are the rules and  
exceedencies of this power, but what the property of it  
is, and how to be maintained.

# Of the Power of the Keyes:

O R,

## Of Binding and Loosing.

**E**Or the clear stating of this point, there is but one Method reasonable, (because but one *asterisme* that hath any powerful influence upon it) the conjunction of the severall passages in the *New Testament* about the donation and exercise of this power. For in matters of *Christi institution*, which have no foundation in the *Law of Nature*, it must needs be improper for reason to interpose and assert, or define what that accounts most agreeable, (for that is to *subject* to our tribunal, not the acts of his *justice*, which God hath been willing to yeild us, *Isa.* 5.3. and *Ezek.* 18.25. and in them to appeal to our own reason, but the acts of his *wisdome*, (for such are all his institutions) which God will not allow us to judge, or dispute, *Rom.* 9. 20.) any farther then by *discourse* to conclude from the context, and words of that *institution*, what is most agreeable to the importance of those words, and by way of *advice*, to direct us to compare our concepts with the doctrines of those, who were nearest to the times of that *institution*, and might probably know more of it (and be more instrumental to us for the deciding any difficulty) then those that being farther removed, look on at that greater distance. And therefore, as in the businesse of the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper*, the surest course to compose the controversies, and satisfy the scruples of men in that point, were to reduce it to its *principles*, and to resolve by consent to assert no more in that point (as matter of faith at least) then

B

might

Pract. Cat. 1.6.

might be naturally and infallibly concluded from the places of *Scripture* concerning the *institution*, *use*, and *nature* of that *Sacrament*, or the *antient primitive* understanding of those places) and naturall deductions from them (for the reducing of which operation to practice, an attempt hath been made in another place) so will it be the most probable towards course, I conceive, least subject to any dangerous mistake, to resolve and observe in this businesse.

## CAP. I.

Sect. 1.

AND then the first thing observable will be, that the three onely places to be met with in the *Gospel* concerning this *institution* (*Matth. 16. 19. Matth. 18. 18. Joh. 20. 23.*) are no two of them fully parallel to one another, or coincident; I meane, no two of them narrations of the same one speech of *Christ*, but (as by the occasion and circumstances of time and place it will appear) each delivered by *Christ* at a severall time; the first *Matth. 16. 19.* was (upon occasion of *Peters confession*) a promise of what should be conferred afterwards upon him by way of reward and encouragement [ *I will* (not yet *de presenti*, I do; but *de futuro*, I will) give thee the Keyes, &c. and then *ὅταν δῶς, whatsoever thou shalt &c.* ] The second *Matth. 18. 18.* was an exemplifying of that glorious truth *ver. 11.* that *Christ* came *σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός, to save that that was lost*: upon the heels of which bare assertion, followes first a *Parable*, *ver. 12. 13. 14.* (a speciall piece of *Christs Logick* and *Rhetorick* to prove popularly, and so to persuade) and then *v. 15.* the institution of a piece of discipline perpetually to continue in the Church of his plantation, as most eminently *instrumental* to that designe, the reducing obstinate sinners to repentance. The consideration of which one thing, that these Keyes, when *Christ* was gone, were to continue employed on that same great work, or deligne, which brought *Christ* into the world, the saving of such as were lost, will be able to set a competent value on this *Institution*, and rescue it from the contempts and scornes, which the impious world is pleas'd to make its portion; very agreeable to that greater stratagem

tagem of Satan, who by complying with our wishes and our interests, easily prevails with vitious men, to believe neither resurrection, nor judgement to come; and this, as it is noted by the Fathers, the κοινὴν δόγμα τὸ νόμος τῆς ἀνομιᾶς καὶ ἀλγῶνς οἶον, the only beloved doctrine of the effeminate and voluptuous. The third place Joh. 20. 23. is apparently part of Christs speech to all his disciples (after his resurrection, and his having confirm'd them all but Thomas, in the truth of it, v. 20.) and was a kind of farewell to his Church, and an actuall inauguration, or consecration of them from disciples into Apostles, as μαθηταὶ disciples, v. 20. and ἀπόστολοι sent, v. 21. put together do import, (and the αὐτοὶ οὖν ἀποστόλοι they that were with them, Luke 24. 33. doth not contradict, for there is no mention of these words, of Binding and Loosing in that Gospel, and if there were, it would not follow that the power of binding was delivered to that mixt company, any more then the power from on high was promised to them v. 49. which surely belonged onely to the Apostles, as will appear by the words immediately precedent, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστέ μαθηταί, being rightly interpreted, [and be ye witnesses of these things] i.e. of his death and resurrection, which we know was peculiarly the office of the Apostles;) which being a solemne donation was set out by a speciall ceremony, viz. that of Christs breathing upon them, a significant one to expresse the τὸ πνεῦμα, the eternall breath or Spirit of God, which he would suddenly poure on them, and for πρὸς τὸ λα- it \* prepares them by this λάβετε πνεῦμα ἁγίον, receive the holy Ghost (which were the words annext to that ceremony, the words of Consecration, the same that we now retain in the Ordination of a Priest) whose sins you do remit, (or ἀν τιναν ἁμάρτια ἴη ἁγὸς Ghost) ἀμαρτίας, if you doe remit any mens sins) they are remitted to them, and if you do retain any, they are retained.

From all which Three places thus compared, the first general result is this, that the power of binding and loosing is a solemne privilege or a Prerogative of the Church of Christ, thrice insisted on by our Saviour. 1. By way of Prediction, that he would conferre it, Matth. 16. then secondly, by way of a more particular description of the manner, and direction for the end and use of It, Matth. 18. And thirdly, by a preparatory kind of instituting them in this power, an initial investing them with this sacred ghostly authority, power.

authority, Joh. 20. (Immediately before his final departure from the world) which seemeth to have been thoroughly perfected and compleated, when after his ascension the Holy Ghost did visibly descend upon those to whom these words were by Christ then delivered, [Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.] This formal compleat-  
 ing of this power (of binding and loosing) upon them, and not only the giving of those gifts of tongues, &c. being a main branch and effect of this descending, and their receiving of the Holy Ghost, according to that of Isa. 32. if you compare ver. 1. of the  
 [King and Princes ruling in judgment, prophetically intimating Christ and his Apostles] with ver. 15. & 16. where the descent of the Spirit is mentioned as a preparative to the exercise of that  
 judicative power. And so Ephes. 4. He gave gifts unto men, v. 8. and gave some Apostles, &c. v. 11. And this I conceive will direct us to the importance of those words, Luke 24. 49. [I send the promise of my Father upon you] so as they may be parallel with this place, Joh. 20. 23. receive the Holy Ghost. No doubt that promise of the Father was the Holy Ghost, Joh. 15. 26. and the [I send upon you] (both as a verbum solenne, I send, i.e. I institute on you; and that in the present, I send, not in the future, I will send) all one with the [labours, receive him] and so the power from on high, in the end of the verse, clearly signifies that visible mission of the Holy Ghost, which they were to expect, as the means of compleating this donation: and so 'tis clear by comparing it with Act. 1. 4. & 8. where the same phrase are used. And therefore Joh. 20. 21. immediately before the [Receive the Holy Ghost] he saith, As my Father sent me, so send I you; intimating that as at his mission to his office he was anointed with the Holy Ghost, Act. 10. 38. viz. upon his Baptisme, Luk. 3. 23. (whereupon 'tis said, that he by the Spirit cast out devils, Mat. 12. 18. which is clearly symbolical, and parallel to his loosing, or remission of sinnes) so the Apostles at their mission, or entrance on their power, should be anointed also.

## C A P. II.

**H**AVING proceeded thus far by way of general prenotation, that which is behind, will, I conceive, be most intelligible, if it be reduced to these few heads. 1. On whom this power was bestowed. 2. In what it consists. 3. To what use 'tis designed; and to what sort of men it belongs objective, or who are to be bound and loosed. 4. What is the real effect of it, or what conjunction it hath with binding and loosing in Heaven.

Sect. 1.

For the first, though to him that considereth the place of *Math. 18.* alone by it selfe (which is an obscure place) the matter be not so cleare to whom this power was given by *Christ*, and though thereupon some mistakes have arisen, and occasion of conceiting this power of binding, &c. to be intitated by *Christ* on the whole aggregate of any particular Church, yet surely the matter will be sufficiently clear, if (as it is most reasonable) we first allow that obscure place leave to borrow light from the two other most evident ones (and not obscure the more evident by that:) and secondly (after we have brought that light to it) observe, what glimmerings of light we shall be able to discern (by that help) even in that obscure place it selfe, which will (as the weak light of the Moon, with that treasure of light, borrowed from the Sun; added to it) become by this meanes exceeding lightsome. For although these three places are not parallel one to the other, in respect of the times and occasions of delivering them, and other circumstances, yet there is no doubt, but they belong all to the same generall matter, the power of binding, &c. And that being (as it is apparent even by that of *Math. 18. 18.*) intitated not on the whole world, or community of men, but determined to some peculiar subject, there is all reason to resolve that that subject, though diversly exprest, is yet the same in all those places, unlesse some evidence of Scripture or authentick testimony of antient Church, or practise shall demonstrate the contrary; which that it doth not, will (as far as concerns the Scripture, which deserves our first search) be thus cleared by considering the severall places.

Sect. 2.

And first *Math. 16. 19.* which was occasioned thus; *Christ* examining

Sect. 3.



examining his disciples what opinion they had of him, is answered by *Simon*, that he was the *Christ*, the *Messias*, the *Some* of the living God, *vers.* 16. upon which *Christ* pronounceth him a blessed person, as having received the supernatural gift of faith from God himselfe, which no humane means could have he'pt him to; and upon this, changes his name from *Simon Bar-Jona* (the only name he had, *vers.* 17.) to *Cephas* in *Syriack*, that is *πίτεξ* in *Greek*, or as *Homer* and other good Authors, and (which beares most affinity with the dialect of this book) the Author of the second book of *Mac. cap.* 4. 31. used it in the masculine *πίτεξ*, signifying a rock or stone, to intimate that he should be (as a foundation or strong rocky stone in a building is a principall ingredient in the building, and a meanes of the future stability of it, *Matth.* 7. 25. the storme and floods and winds came upon it, and it fell not, because *καταβλήτω ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν*, it was founded on such a firme rocky stone) a principal part, call it foundation, or rocke, or pillar of that Church of Christians, which partly by this confession of his, here recorded to all posterity, and partly by his future teaching, he should be a meanes to erect for *Christs* service: and then being so glorious an Instrument of converting so many, *Christ* is pleased to give him the Keyes of this Kingdome; λέγει τὸ, δώσω σοι, ἐξουσίαν, ὡς πατὴρ ἰδοὺς σοὶ τὸν ἀποδύειν, ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰς κλείς. *Theophyl.* in *Mat.* 16. authoritatively he gave him the keyes, as his Father had done the Revelation, ἐξουσίαν ἀφέναι, &c. as he goes on, a power of binding and loosing, &c. so ἐμαρτυρῶν συγχωρήσεις καὶ ἐπιμνήσεις, the pardoning and punishing of sinnes, in a word, is spirituall grace or power, or jurisdiction over these future Converts of his (as generally in the *Apostles* times, and after, he that converted any Country or chiefe City in his *Apostleship*, was settled as their *Bishop* or Governour in spirituall matters, and so continued all his life, unlesse having settled them, he thought good to commit that office, and power to some body else, that so he might be the more free to go and preach and convert more) though not as yet, because they were not by him as yet converted, yet by way of promise in *diem* to be performed, when time should serve; I will give thee the keyes, and what soever thou shalt bind, &c. the summe is, Peter was to be an *Apostle*, and to do wonders in converting whole Nations to *Christ*; and among





*Congregation; and therefore after the (ἀποστολὴν Joh. 20. 21. I send you) (the forme of words that made them Apostles answerable to the ἀποστολὴν, messengers among the Jewes, and not farre unlike to the Proconsuls sent out, though on a quite distant arrant of secular power, among the Romans) immediately follows the ἐμπνοή, he breathed on them (proportionable to God's course of making a living soul, Gen. 2. v. 2. by breathing on him the breath of life) and said, Receive the Holy Ghost, If you remit any mens sinnes, they are remitted; if you retain, they are retained; which words were apparently delivered, (and in them this power) to as many as were breathed on, i. e. to as many as were sent by Christ, and indeed to no more, unlesse either first by way of Communication from them to their successours, or secondly by speciall immediate vocation from heaven, by the bath col, as the Hebrewes phrase is, the daughter of thunder, i. e. voice from heaven sent to consecrate them. Thus St Paul who was none of the twelve, yet speaking of the power of excommunicating, saith, it was given to him (to him not as a successour of the Apostles, but to him as one called immediately from heaven) by the Lord, or by Christ, 2 Cor. 13. 10. In a word, it was by Christ immediately then given to the Apostles all and each of them, and to none else, till Matthias was received into the place of Judas, and St Paul was afterward extraordinarily designed, and called unto the same office, together with Barnabas, Act. 13. 12. proportionably it may seem to what befell the twelve Patriarchs, Ephraim and Manasses being taken in, in Josephs stead that died, as these two in the place of James the brother of John, who was cut off, before he came to do that work to which he was sent, the preaching to all Nations.*

*Sec. 5.*

Those two places thus agreeing on the *subjects* of this power, or *objects* of this donation, 'tis already more then probable, that the third witnesse producible will agree with those two, or if it seem otherwise, sure 'twill not be thought reasonable, that these two shall be forced and violence to consent to that, which is but an alien sense, by some *Interpreters* imposed upon that third.

*Sec. 6.*

This third place I shall set down at large, because I acknowledge there is some *difficulty* in it, Matt. 18. 15. *If thy brother shall offend*

*ἀποστολὴν  
ἀποστολὴν.  
Theophyl.  
To all the  
Apostles*

offend against thee, it seems the place belongs not (primarily, but only paritate rationis, by analogie of reason) to all sins in the latitude, but peculiarly, to trespasses or personal injuries done by one brother, one Christian to another; as besides the expresse words v. 15. (if thy brother trespass against thee) is more clear by S. Peters question to the same purpose, v. 21. (How oft shall my brother trespass against me, and I forgive him?) Go and reprove him, ἐλαγχον ἢ ἐλαγχῃς, ἢ αἰ- i. e. either reprehend him for it, (as the word is used sometimes καρυμμένον Phavor. & when 'tis joyned with πεινῶ, chasten or discipline, Heb. 12. 5. ἐλαγχω, τὸ καρυμμένον by private admonitions to bring him to a sense) (i. e. do thy best ἀπόπειμα τι- νος αἰς φῶς ἀ- γω, ἢ ἀπὸ φ- τὸ ἀληθὲς πα- νέρω, ib. & so Joh. 3. 20. He that doth evil cometh not to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved, ἐλαγχῇ [discovered] in our margent; and therefore 1 Cor. 14. 24. when 'tis said of the unbeliever, that he is convinced of all, &c. 'tis added, v. 25. Thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest. so Ephes. 5. 13. All things that are reproved, or discovered, are made manifest by the light; for whatsoever doth make manifest, is light. ἢ ἐλαγχῆσαι, αἰ- χρω θέσται, & ἐλαγχῇ ἢ ἐπ' αἰχρῶν τίθεται, & ἐλαγχον ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰχρῶν. Ph.

But if he beare thee not, if this first method of thy charity, and discipline of this calmer making succeed not, another assay must be made, another artifice used, Take with thee (ἤτις farther, or over and above) one, or two, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established, i. e. that the thing which thou laiest to his charge, be so confirmed; according to that, Joh. 8. 17. The testimony of two men is true, i. e. of sufficient authority in law (according to an Hebraisme, whereby ΤΟΝ ἀληθὲς true, among the Greek translators signifieth πιστός fit to be credited) that so either by the testimony of these as witnesses, he may no longer be able to deny the fact (as Heb. 6. 16. an oath is said to be εἰς βεβαιώσιν, for establishing, or confirmation, in that it is ἀπὸ λογίας πῆγας an end of affirming & denying. The thing so established (βεβαιω- θὲν or καθὲν) by oath, cannot be denied, or the parties denial will

Sec. 7.

longer stand him in stead) or by authority of these he may be induced (as the Judge is on the accused, *Deut. 10. 19. Heb. 10. 28.*) to give sentence on, to condemne himself; which if it may be obtained, is the prime end of all these charitable artifices, to bring the injurious to a *sight* and *shame*, the best preparatives to reformation; To which purpose is that of *Tertullian*, *Apol. c. 39. Disciplinam preceptorum inculcationibus densamus*, We thicken the doctrine of precepts with waies of inculcating, i.e. presse them to reformation, whom our doctrine will not prevail on; where he mentions these three degrees, *exhortationes, castigationes, censuras, exhortations, and chastisements, and then censure.*

## Sect. 8.

By what hath been said of this place, and in it by observing the method of the first and second admonition, you will by the way understand the meaning of that obscure verse in *S<sup>t</sup> Paul*, *2 Cor. 13. 1. This third time I come unto you, in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established, &c.* It refers clearly to this usage of the second admonition. *S<sup>t</sup> Paul* had written before, which was as it were the first single admonition, which *v. 2.* he calls (*παρακαλα* I told you formerly;) but that prevailing not, at his third coming (which it seems was his second meddling with this matter, *παρακαλῶ τὸ δεύτερον*, I foretell you the second time, *ver. 2.* he doth that which is answerable to the taking with him *ἔτι ἕνα ἢ δύο, one or two more*, as appears by the addition of these very words which are in *Matth.* [*in the mouth of two or three witnesses, &c.*] which is, you see, the stile and character of the second admonition. This by the way.

## Sect. 9.

But if he hear not them (*παροξύνει*), if he be still refractory, either through non-conviction of the fact, or non-contrition for it) if this second admonition be not in event *εἰς διδακὴν*, *2 Cor. 13. 10* to edification, or instruction, if it work not on him, then tell it to the Church, [*I shall tell you what that is presently*] and if he hear not the Church (continue his refractariness still) let him be unto thee as a heathen or a publican] which may possibly signifie, that in that case thou hast liberty to implead him, as thou wouldst do any heathen, in any foreign heathen Court, for that injury, that trespass done to thee, which was at the first mentioned. For certainly though it were unlawful for a Christian, both here, and *1 Cor. 6. 1.* to implead a Christian for a personall trespass before

fore a beathen tribunal, yet to deal thus with a beathen (or publican which was in account the same) was not either by Christ, or the Apostle counted unlawful (but only the *ἀσυνετός ἄνθρωπος*, i.e. Christian with Christian, v. 6.) and consequently with a perverse refractory brother, whom you see Christ gives leave to account and deal with, as with a beathen or publican, it would not be unlawful also. But another interpretation I shall not doubt to propose to you, that by beathen and publican may be meant a desperate deplored sinner, such as the Rabbins call *מורא* i.e. *ἀμαρτωλός* a sinner, as in the Gospel *ἄνθρωπος μωρὸς*, a deplored sinner, Thus in Musar, If he will not then, (i.e. when two or three friends have been taken to be present at his admonition) be reconciled, go and leave him to himself; for such an one is implacable, and is called *מורא*, of whom again 'tis there said, *Si nec hoc modo quicquam profecerit, i.e. adhibitis amicis*, if this second admonition does no good, *debet eum pūdefacere coram multis*, he must be asbamed before many, (which may be the meaning of *Dic Ecclesie*, Tell it to the Church, as will anon appear by 1 Tim. 5. 10.) and this interpretation of that phrase will seem most probable, if you mark

1. That *τελῶνας* & *ἀμαρτωλοὶ* publicans and sinners are frequently joyned together in the Gospel, as once *Publicani* and *harlots*, those *ἡμαρτανῆς ἀμαρτωλοὶ* sinner-women.
2. That the heathen are call'd *ποινῶς* sinners, as when 'tis said that Christ was by the Jews delivered into the hands of sinners, i.e. Romans beathen, and in St Paul [not sinners of the Gentiles:] and then those words, [Let him be to thee a beathen and a publican] will found no more, but [give him over as a desperate deplored sinner,] to whom those privileges of a Christian (viz. of not being impleaded before an beathen tribunal) &c. do not belong, i.e. leave him to himself. This sure is the simplest rendring of the place, and then he that is such, that is capable of that denomination, is certainly fit, and ripe for the censures of the Church, which follow in the next verse, and are appointed to go out against this refractory incorrigible.

For so immediately it follows, *Verily I say unto you: who are those you?* why 1. In the plurall number [*οὗτοι*.] Secondly *οὗτοι* *μαθηταὶ* to you disciples (for so in the first verse *ἡμεῖς* is understood the disciples came to him with a question, and v. 3. he said, *Verily I*



say to you, i. e. to you disciples, and v. 12. τί οὖν λέγετε, what do you think? asking the disciples, or appealing to their own judgement, and so still the same auditors continued, and his speech addressed to them, I say unto you (disciples). what soever you shall bind on earth, &c.

Sec. II.

After this, it follows v. 19. again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree upon earth, &c. Many false illations are by men of different persuasions made from these words, which will all vanish, I conceive, and the truth be dis-involved, if the Reader will not despise this one observation which I shall offer to him; and it is this, that the method oft-times used in Scripture is, (when it hath proposed one or two severals to speak of) to resume the last first, and so orderly to go back, till it come to the first, to which you may accommodate that expression, and description of Gods method in other things. Many that are last, are first (the last in proposing, first in handling or resuming,) and the first last.

If there be two things mentioned one after another, and any occasion to adde any thing on each of them, then I say the observation is, that the Scripture sometimes useth to resume the second first, and the first after that. And so if there be more then two. I said this was oft-times the manner and stile of Scripture, and to make good my observation, I am a little obliged to go out of my way, and present you with some examples. Three visible ones I shall offer you out of one book, the Epistle to the Hebrews. First, Chap. 4. where in the foure first verses there are three things propounded of an High Priest, 1. That he offer for sinne, and negotiate the cause of men with God. 2. That he be compassionate toward sinners, and to that end he himself infirm, and offer for himselfe as well as the people. 3. That he be called to this office by God himself. To these three the Author speaks particularly (and applies them to Christ) in the remainder of the Chapter, by way of παράδειγμα, to the last, first, v. 5, 6. So likewise Christ glorified not himself to be made an high Priest, &c. To the second next, v. 7. & 8. who in the dayes of his flesh offered up prayers, and supplications, prayers; and the ceremonies of petitioners (for so ἱκετεύειν properly signifies, olive branches, the embleme that petitioners used to have in their hands) with strong crying and teares

ἡ ἱκετεύειν ὁ  
θαλάσσιον ἐλά-  
ας ὃ καὶ δὲ  
ἐλάας ἐξεί-  
πετο γὰρ ὁ  
ὁ ἱκετεύων  
κατὰ τὸν  
ῥαβδόν.

teares to him that ~~was~~ able to deliver him out of death, (as when he commended his spirit into Gods hands, and cryed with a loud voice, Matth. 27. 50. Mark 15. 37. Luke 23. 46. at the delivering these words) And <sup>1</sup> *was heard*, for, or by his piety, through the great <sup>2</sup> *ardency* of that his prayer (expressed both by the loud voice in three Evangelists, and by the bodily worship, bowing of his head, in the fourth, Job. 19. 30.) or as it may possibly signifie, He *was delivered* from his fear, i. e. from that which he feared and prayed against. And though he were a Son, yet from the things he suffered, he learnt obedience, (whether to God thus designing him to those sufferings, and to that office of hearing prayers, or to men, by giving them audience in their prayers, as *ἰσακούω* signifies, so to beare, as to answer a request.) And then the Author returns to the first, last, v. 9. Being made perfect he became the author of eternall salvation, &c.

Thus secondly, Heb. 9. 1. the Author having named two things, the *δικαιώματα λατρίας*, the ordinances of worship, and the *ἀγίων κοσμηδόν*, he dilates first of the latter of them, v. 2, 3, 4, 5. For there *was* a tabernacle made, the first, &c. and after the second vaile, the tabernacle, &c. and over it the Cherubims of glory shadowing the *ἱλαστήριον* the (not mercy-seat, but) <sup>k</sup> covering of the arke, &c. all these belonging to the second particular, and then afterwards he comes back to the former, the ordinances of worship, v. 6. Now <sup>2</sup> *when these things were thus ordain'd, the Priest went abwaies*, &c.

<sup>2</sup> So כפרת from כפר (which signifies both to propitiate and to cover) is

here to be rendred *covering*, and though the Greek be *ἱλαστήριον* from the former sense of the word, yet being to denote a part of the Arke in this place, it must be taken in the other sense of the Hebrew, and rendred, as if it had been *כסא־הכבוד*, As *Exod. 26. 34. and 30. 6.* or as the Hebrew כפרת if it had been retained, would have imported.

So thirdly, Chap. 10. 33. the Author having mentioned two acts of suffering in them, the first personall in themselves, by reproaches, and afflictions, the second by way of sympathy with their Apostle, *κοινωνοὶ ὧν ἔστω ἀναστενόμενοι*, partakers with, or relievers of others that were so tossed; in the next verse he resumes both again, but first the latter, For ye had compassion of me in my bands, ver. 34. and then secondly the former, took joyfully the spoiling of your goods.

This is farther evidenced by an example in this Gospel;



Matth. 23. 6. Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine, lest they tread them under their feet, and turning again, tear and rend thee. Where there is no doubt, but the former of these latter speeches belongs to the latter of the former, and the latter of the latter to the former of the former; per modum regressus, by way of going backward thus, Lest the swine tread the pearls under their feet, and Lest the dogs rend and tear thee. For it is not the manner of swine to fall upon men, and tear them, but of dogs it is; and it is not the manner of dogs to tread a thing under their feet, but of swine it is; So the 2 Cor. 2. 15. St Paul having mentioned the σωζήσωσι first, and then the ἀλλοιῶσι, them that are saved, and them that perish; he goes back, ver. 16. First to the latter of them, to those a savour of death unto death, but to these a savour of life unto life; So in the Epistle to Philemon v. 5. hearing of thy love, and faith which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus, and towards all the Saints; 'tis apparent that the Lord Jesus is the object of the faith, and the [all Saints] the object of the love. So again Rom. 14. having set down two heads of discourse, that the strong should not set at nought the weak; nor secondly the weak judge or condemne the strong, v. 3. he resumes the latter first, v. 4. who art thou that judgest? and then v. 10. returns to the former, and thou why dost thou set at nought thy brother? So Matth. 23. 25. Christ having mention'd first the outside of the cup or platter, then the inside, v. 26. he returns first to the cleansing of the inside, then the outside of it. So 1 Cor. 6. 11. after the generall of washing, which contains the two subsequent, sanctifying and justifying; the mention of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is first named, must belong to the latter of the two, that of justification; and the Spirit of our God to the former, that of sanctifying.

Señ. 12.

Other examples of this observation I shall leave the Reader to observe, when he reads the Scripture more ponderingly, and only proceed to help him to take notice of it in the point in hand. Three cases, it is apparent, are here mention'd orderly by our Saviour in the matter of trespassse, 1. Telling the trespasser of his fault between him and thee alone. Secondly, taking one or two with thee, to do it more convincingly, and with greater authority. Thirdly, telling the Church of it. Having said somewhat to each of these, as he delivered them in the three first verses,

verses, 19, 16, 17. he resumes the matter again, and speaks first to the last of them, v. 18. telling them, what, after the not succeeding of the third admonition, the Apostles and their successors are to do, when the cognizance of this injury and contumacy comes before them (which, that in every case of trespass, it alwayes should, I conceive, doth not hence appear to be necessary, save only in case that the Magistrate or secular tribunal be heathen, because that supposition may perhaps be the ground of the *fit tibi Ethnicus*, on which the other is superstructed) viz. excommunicate such a refractory till reformation, and then upon that, absolve him again, and [verily I say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c.] From this view it is not irrational to conclude, that the *ἐκκλησία* and the *δυναμίς*, the Church and the disciples (considered prophetically under the notion of Apostles, i.e. Founders first, then Governours of Churches) may in that place signifie the same thing. So saith St Chrysost. in Mat. Hom. 6. *ἐντε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῖς τοῖς πρεσβυτέρω*, Tell it to the Church, i.e. to the Presidents and Rulers of it; and Theophyl. in Mat. 18. *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρεσβυτέρω*, &c. the Church for the Rulers of the Church; To which purpose it is observable, what Kimchi a Jewish learned Rabbi hath affirmed, that the Governours, and Rulers are oft meant by the word *קהל* *ἐκκλησία*, or Congregation; and so Philo. *ἐκκλησία*, *ἐκκλησία*, the Congregation is the Priests. Agreeable to which is the inscription of the ancient Apostolical Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, *ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ παριστάμενη ἐν Ῥώμῃ*, The Church of God that dwells at Rome, meaning, I conceive by the title [the Church] himself (who wrote the Epistle, and was chief there, or Bishop at that time) and the other Clergy with him; For so the other part of the inscription [*ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ παριστάμενη ἐν Κορίνθῳ*, for the Church of God at Corinth] is after explained by him, in the words *ἐπισκόποις, καὶ πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ διακόνεσσιν*, to the Bishops, and Deacons; but if this will not be acknowledged, then by *ἐκκλησία* I shal give you leave to understand any meeting or Congregation of pious men, either a confessor Presbyterorum, a Colledge of Presbyters, which were ordinarily assistant to the Bishop in the ancient Church, or possibly the whole or any part of the people convened, whose authority or consent may work somewhat upon the offender, as St Paul conceives it were apt

to doe, when he commands Timothy, *ἀμαρτάνοντα ἐν ὄψει πάντων ἐλέγχεω*, to rebuke the offenders before all men, i.e. in the presence of the community of the people, 1 Tim. 5. 20. and perhaps when he speaks of the *ἐκκλησία ἡ ὑπὸ τοῦ πλείονων*, 2 Cor. 2. 6. the rebuke that was by or under the many, though it be not certain whether that signifie the chastisement, (as our English reads) punishment and censure inflicted by the Presbyterie, or ὑπὸ under them, those assisting or joyning in the censure, *συλλεγόμενοι*, acts of Canonical severity, (which in case of sorrow and relenting of the offender upon rebuke, or admonition before ejection out of the Church, were wont to be thought sufficient without excommunication, and after excommunication, as in this place to the Corinthians, if they were submitted to, were sufficient, though not presently to restore him to the communion, yet to make him capable of being prayed for by the Church, 1 Job. 5. 16. and to be delivered from the stripes of Satan, the diseases that the delivering to Satan in the Apostles times brought upon them; ) or whether, as the words may be rendred, it import the rebuke, or reproof, viz. the third admonition, (or the second given by the Bishop, which was equivalent to that) which was ὑπὸ under, or in the presence of many, viz. of the people or Congregation. The former of these senses seems more agreeable to the place to the Cor. the latter rather to belong to that in the 1 Tim. and so that which even now in Musar was *coram multis*, before many, and in S. Paul. (if not ὑπὸ πλείονων under many, yet) ἐνώπιον πάντων in the presence of all men, Christ may here expresse by *ἐκκλησία* the Church. This interpretation being admitted, or not rejected, it then follows commodiously, and reasonably in the text of the Evangelist, that after the matter is brought to them (i.e. to those many) or after this act of reproofe, or rebuke before them, & upon continued refractarinesse to these last admonitions, then the *ἐμεῖς* (that sure is) the Apostles or Governors of the Church, the Pastors, (which cannot be in any reason excluded from under the former word *ἐκκλησία* Church, whatsoever it signifies) and those already promised this power, chap. 16. may, or shall bind, or excommunicate them. And that is the summe of the 18. v. in reference to the 17. and then v. 19. Again I say unto you, (or as a very <sup>1</sup> ancient Manuscript, and some printed copies read it,

<sup>1</sup> In Coll.  
Magd. Oxon.

it, *παλιν εμνη λέγω υμιν*, again verily I say unto you, that second verily noting the speech to be of a new matter) that if two of you shall agree upon the earth, or here below, (in reference to the second thing mention'd, v. 16. take with you one or two) concerning any thing, which they shall aske, it shall be done unto them of my Father, &c. For where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them, which words are brought to give authority to the solemn admonitions of the second order (address'd by the injur'd man, accompanied with one or two assistants or witnesses to inforce them) by telling them, that as the *confessus trium virorum*, the assize of three men among the Jewes had some power; so shall any two or three Christians be considerable in this matter, having the privilege of Gods presence, as in their prayers thus united, so also in this act of united admonition; for, first, God is to be thought to be in the midst of them, (as that fourth person added to the three children in the furnace, and the face of that fourth like the Son of God) to be present with them (as it is 1 Cor. 5.4.) in this his ordinance, in this piece of Discipline apointed by him; whereupon the *παρακαλι* the refractariness of the transgressor is become so much the greater in this case; and besides, secondly, if upon admonition, they shall be harkned to, it will be in their power to pray for the penitent trespasser, (as James 5.16.) and that prayer of theirs joyned with the injured person is likely to be more effectual than a single prayer, and so in both these respects a greater weight is set on the *παρακαλι* *δύο* the taking of one, or two with him. Thus having returned to the second of the three, in the second place, and dispatched that, the method would direct to go on to the first again in the third place; but in stead of that, St. Peter it seems asks again about it, how long a man is to forgive private injuries; and the answer in the following words supplieth the place of having proceeded to that, and serves for the conclusion of the whole matter.

The result then of this whole Chapter is this, that of the three places of the Gospel, concerning the donation of the power of binding and loosing, two of them at the first sight most clearly convince, this power to be given to the Apostles, as governors of the Church, & which will not be communicable to any, but either

to others that are κλητοὶ ἀποστόλων also, set apart to the office, immediately by Christ, or to their successors, οἱ καὶ Περὶ ἐπιστολῆς ἀξιοῦντες χάρις Θεοῦ. Theoph. in Mat. 18.) and the third upon a thorough consideration doth the same also. For this we have the plain testimony of Theophylact on that place Mat. 18. πᾶσι ἀποστόλοις δέδοται. οὔτε; ὅτε εἶπεν, ἀν τινος ἀφ' αὐτοῦ, &c. The power of binding and loosing was given to all the Apostles; When? why, when he said, Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c. i.e. in this place of St. John: and again, [καὶ ἔδωκα] μὴλλοντα χρόνον σημαίνει, τούτοις καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀνάστασιν. [and I will give] it signifies the future, i.e. the time after the resurrection, which is that in S. John also; and again on Mat. 16. ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἀφέναι καὶ δεσμεῖν, where the binding in S. Mat. and the remitting in S. John are put together, as belonging to the same matter: and it is confirm'd by no mean authority, that of S. Paul himself, of himself, 2 Cor. 13. 10. where speaking of these censures, (noted there by ἀποτίμωσις καὶ ἔσθλα using excision, & καθ' αἰρέσει, which is all one, and which, it seems, he as an Apostle was to use among them, he, not the Congregation; ἐφ' ἑσέμα I will not spare) he addeth καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἣν ἔδωκε μοι ὁ Χρῆστος, according to the power that Christ hath given me, (which sure was not peculiar to him, but common to the rest of the Apostles, which had it before him, and in a more ordinary way) and ver. 3. he distinctly calls it, Christ speaking in him, a high expression, making every such act of judicature in him, an act of Christ.

## CAP. III.

Sect. I.

**T**He only difficulty remaining in the point, will be, who are the Apostles successors in that power; and when the question is asked of that power, I must be understood of the power of governing the Church peculiarly (of which the power of the Keyes was, and is a principal branch) for it must again be remembered, that the Apostles are to be considered under a double notion: 1. As Planters, then as Governors of the Church. The title of ἀπόστολος in its literall notation of *Mission*, sent, (*Embassador* or *Messenger*) belongs peculiarly to the former of these, and so though it have some extraordinary privileges annex to it, necessary

cessary to the work of *planting*, (as the gift of tongues, the power of *working miracles*) which ennobles it beyond the order of *Governours* in the *Churches* since their plantation, yet in the persons of the *Apostles*, it was but a precedaneous power, preparatory to that other of *ruling*, or *governing*, which no doubt is the reason that *Chrysost.* calls *Ignatius* the martyr, both *ἡγούμενος* & *ἐπίσκοπος*, an *Apostle* and *Bishop*, and perhaps is the meaning of that saying of an *Anonymus* writer, in *m Photius*, *ὅτι ὁ ἡγούμενος Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου, καὶ χειροτονήσεται ἐπίσκοπος ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος*, καὶ ἐνθρονισθήσεται, That the *Apostle Timothy* was by *St Paul* ordained, and enthronized, or seated *Bishop* of the *Metropolis* of the *Ephesians*, i.e. that he that had helped to plant *Churches*, and so was an *Apostle* sent out to that purpose, was at length ordained *Bishop* to govern that of *Ephesus* being planted. Which distinction being premised, the question will now more easily be satisfied, being proposed in these terms, [Who were the *Apostles* successors in that power, which concerned the governing these *Churches* which they had planted] And 1. I answer, that it being a matter of fact, or story, later then that the *Scripture* can universally reach to it, cannot be fully satisfied, or answered from thence, any further then the persons of *Timothy* or *Titus*, &c. and the severall *Angels* of the *Churches* in the *Apocalypse* (who are acknowledged by all the *Antients* to be single persons, that had power over all others in those *Churches*), but will in the full latitude through the *universal Church* in those times, be made clear from the next evidences, that we have, viz. from the consent of the *Greek* and *Latine* Fathers, who generally resolve, that *Bishops* are those successors. This I shall not be so unreasonable as to attempt to prove at large through the writings of those Fathers, but content my self with one or two of the first of them.

Of this number I conceive the testimony of *Clement Romanus* in his *Epistle* to the *Corinth*. (which hath been so often of late produced) might to any disinterested person be allowed to have some force in it; where speaking of the *Apostles*, he saith, that they foreseeing that there would be convention and emulation, περί ὀνόματος ἐπισκοπῆς about the name, or (as ὄνομα may denote, ἀξίωμα) dignity of *Bishops* or *Episcopacy*, μεταξὺ ἐπισκοπῶν διεσέσθαι

Sect. 2.

P. 57.



(for I doubt not but that is the reading, and the sense there) they set down a list, or continuation of successors, (as when *Hesychius*, (and out of him *Varinus*) renders *ἐπίσκοποι, κληρονόμοι*, perhaps it may be a false print, as there be many in the edition of that book, for *ἐπίσκοποι, κληρονομία*, but howsoever the *Analogy* from thence will extend to this also, that as *ἐπίσκοποι* signifies *κληρονόμοι*, so *ἐπίσκοποι*, will signifie *κληρονομία*, inheritance, or succession) that when any dyed such a certain person should succeed him. To which affirmation of *Clemens*, when I have added (that which all Ecclesiasticall Stories have made familiar to us) that there were preserved in several Churches such<sup>n</sup>rols and catalogues of Bishops beginning from the Apostles in each See, I shall conceive that that of *Clemens* was a pertinent testimony to this purpose; especially when the voice of antiquity is so clear, that *Clemens* himself was one of those Bishops (an Adjutor of the Apostles in their life time, and after the departure of *Linus*, and *Cletus*, the onely one that retained the name of Bishop in Rome, all others being stiled Presbyters only) that *P Vedelius* at Geneva hath at large acknowledged it, *Exercit. in Ignat. Ignat. Epist. ad Mar. Cassabol. c. 3.*

<sup>n</sup> δὲ δὲ κατὰ  
τὸ πᾶν ὃ ἐπισ-  
κοπῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ  
ἀποστόλων κα-  
τὰ τὴν κλήρον  
ἐλάμβανον.  
*Iren. lib. 3. cap.  
3. & successio-  
nes Episcopo-  
rum quibus A-  
postolicam que  
in unoquoque  
loco est, Eccle-  
siam tradide-  
runt, lb. lib. 4.  
cap. 63.*

ὁ τεῖτα τὸ πᾶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλων ὃ ἐπισκοπῆν κληρὸν Κλημῆς, *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3.* *P Solus Clemens superstes, solus Episcopi nomen retinuit, cum quia inter adjutores Apostolorum solus ipse restabat, cum quia jam invaluerat distinctio Episcopi, & Presbyteri, ita ut ceteris Ecclesie Romane Presbyteris qui cum solo Clemente essent, nomen illud non fuerit tributum.*

### Sec<sup>t</sup>. 3.

After *Clemens* (an assertor at once, and example of this truth) I must next appeal to the Martyr *Ignatius* himself also Bishop of Antioch, that lived in the Apostles age, and is by the enemies of Episcopacy discerned to be so full a treasure of this truth (and of others in this kind) in so many notable passages, that there hath been no way (imaginable by those who resolve to have it otherwise) to resist the plainness of his authorities; but first by <sup>q</sup> scoffes and defamations; Secondly, by <sup>r</sup> confident rejecting of our whole volume of his Epistles, as spurious, and of a latter birth; and thirdly, by some very slender shewes of proof, that they are so. One special of this sort (which I see

<sup>q</sup> Ignatius a-  
nalogos ἐκκα-  
τος ubique in-  
culcat Episco-  
porum supra  
Presbyteros  
gradum emi-  
nentem. *Salmas. ap. ad l. de prim. Pap. p. 55.* <sup>r</sup> Non esse Ignatium tam certò scio quam me hæc scribere. *ib. p. 58.* non esse Ignatium luce clarius est, & c. nemo mihi unquam persuadebit, *Sec. p. 56.*

lately



lately made use of by *Salmasius*, and for which it (now appears he was beholding to a sight of *Blundels* book, not then printed) I shall mention to remove prejudices, and it is this; that in the *Epistle* to the *Magnesiums*, he distinctly calls *Episcopacy* *νασιεική τάξις*, which, saith that learned *Grammarians*, signifies it to be a new Order, and he attempts to prove it, because *τάξις*, saith he, cannot be referred to the age; and *νασιεική* signifies *ναυδς*, agreeable whereunto he interprets *νασιεικής ὁμοθυμίας*, 2 Tim. 2. 22. to be *novæ*, or *novarum rerum cupiditates*, new desires, or of new things.

<sup>†</sup> *Hæc argumenta præstantissimo Salmasio nuper probata gaudeo. Blondel. Apol.*

The dealing of this learned *Grammarians* in this business will be sufficiently strange to him, that considers the whole matter. I shall only (in passing) give some few hints of judging it, by telling you first, that the generality of Copies read not *νασιεική τάξις*, but *ἐπίσκοπα* the youth of the Bishop (and no one of the Greek editions hath so much as mention'd any various lection in that place, till now the Florentine or Laurentian copy hath given us that variety.) Secondly, that the whole context of the *Epistle* drives to this of *ἐπίσκοπα*, as even this Author confesses, by saying, that he perswades them to receive their Bishop, and give him honour, *quamvis ætate juniori*, though he were younger than they, and again that he goes on to tell them, *ὅτι ὑμῖν δὲ πρέπον μὴ συγγᾶσαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ*, that it becomes them not to be too familiar with the age of their Bishop. But then besides this, thirdly, the vulgar, and even Geneva edition reading *ἐπίσκοπα*, back it with citation of places of Scripture pertinent only to that sense, as that *Wisdome is not alwayes with the hoary hair*, &c. Fourthly, that other reading is not avowed by, or cited from any Greek manuscript, but only that in the *Laurentiana Bibliotheca*, and the old Latine, made use of by the most Reverend Primate of *Armach*, which is directly translated out of it, and so doth not at all add to the authority. But then fifthly, if that reading of *νασιεική τάξις* should be acknowledged, yet would it conclude nothing against the Order of Bishops in those first times. For 1. what if it were a new Order in *Ignatius* his time? that were pretty antient, *Ignatius* living with the Apostles; for that it was written by some body else above 200. years after Christ, wil want some other probation. Secondly, there is no necessity

Señ. 4.

that *νεωτερον ταξι* must signifie a new order, for although, as he saith, *ταξι* doth not signifie age, nor *νεωτερον* young, but may be interpreted *καινως* new, &c. yet we are not bound to accept that interpretation of it, when the Context of the Epistle belongs to another matter, and when another interpretation of this phrase may be given, which (if that reading were acknowledged) will reconcile all difficulties; For why may not *ταξι* signifie ordination? and *νεωτερον* that, that belongs to a *νεωτερος* or a young man, and so it shall be the Ordination of a young man, or a young mans being Bishop, which might have been apt to provoke contempt in inferiors, if that good Martyr had not fortified them against that temptation. And lastly for the interpretation of that place of S. Paul to Timothy, it is so new, and so irrationally preferred before the ordinary one, that one may justly conclude, 'twas prejudice, and willingness to find an example for his novelty, that made him think of this; for why should not the lusts (there appointed to be avoided) be youthfull lusts, or such as young men are subject to? why new lusts; or desires of new things? were not the old ordinary lusts (so frequent among young men) fit enough to be avoided? might any other be enjoyed, so they were not new? I am sorry I have insisted so long on so weak an objection, and yet it is the best that that learned man (so much looked on, and believed in this matter by those who desire change) hath produced, on which to build a l his confidence, that those Epistles are not Ignatius's: And 'tis a little strange that another learned man \* And. Rivot should speak of Episcopacy as of a novell order, and adde [*five ταξις ut loquitur Ignatius νεωτερον*] making Ignatius to say this, which if he doth, then is not only his Illustriss. Salmatius deceived, but also Episcopacy must be acknowledged in Ignatius's time, in which if it were acknowledged to be novel, it will still be antient enough; and so 'tis indeed by that Author confest (perhaps by incogiancy) in the next page, when he acknowledges, that the custome of Presbyters joyning with the Bishop in imposition of hands on a Presbyter (which sure is to suppose, not to deny the office of Bishops) *ex veteris aevi reliquiis mansit*, and specifies what age he means, by [*juxta illud Apostoli per impositionem manuum Presbyterii*] wherein yet it had been more ingenuons to have rendered

\* Gror. discuss.  
Dia. p. 400.

rendered *μετὰ αὐτὸν*, and not have chang'd it into *per*, quite contrary to the text; but this by the way. As for that other argument added by *Salmasius*, that in that *Epistle* to the *Magnesian* there is mention of the word *οὐκ* (as when he saith that *Christ* was not, *ὅτι οὐκ ὁ κύριος τοῦ σώματος*) by which he concludes that *Epistle* written after *Valentinus*, whose *Idiom* that was; if the argument were concluding, (as *Js. Vossius* in his late Edition hath sufficiently proved it is not) it cannot sure be in force Annot. p. 277 against us, who find no such thing in our former *Greek Copies*; or, if we did, could readily acknowledge any such passage to be *supposititious*, and those few words taken into the text out of the margin, without casting away the whole volume of *Epistles* in that fit of jealousy, or rage; if I could discern in that writer any other shew of argument against that general opinion, which the *Christian* world hath had of these *Epistles*, I should proceed to the weighing of it. But now upon the Edition of *Blondels* book (out of which *Salmasius* only brought us some gleanings) we find a great deal of paines taken to cast off those *Epistles*; and it is very observable first, that he that hath taken in all the ancient *Church-writers* into his catalogue (even *Hermas* himselfe, without any note or character of *apocryphal* set upon him) and out of each of them laboured (though very improsperously) to gather some honey to his hive, some word or other, that might look like an accordance with that opinion which he asserts out of *S<sup>t</sup> Hierome*, and, it seemes, had skill enough to make even *Tertullian*, *Irenaeus*, and *Cyprian*, (and many others that have innumerable manifest places against the *ισοψημία* or equality of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*) instrumental to his deligne, was not able to find one sentence in *Ignatius*, which might be perswaded to be usefull to him, and therefore hath expressed that severity on him, that he hath not thought reasonable on any other, even those which all antiquity hath rejected; So partial and unequal is the mind of man, when that *ἀπιστία* *ἀνδραγαθία* (that I say no worse) hath the ruling of our counsels. The exceptions which this learned man hath made against *Ignatius* being the author of those *Epistles*, are 1. *Scriptiois genus affectatum*, an affected kind of writing, pompous Epithets (which saith he, could not agree with an *Apostle*, panting in the chains of

of Martyrs) such as θεοφόρος, &c. ἀνίσχυρος, ἀνθρωπύμορφος, and among them πολυπληθία, ἀχαυχισία, πρηνπάθεια] the very naming of which, I suppose, doth shew the frivolousnesse of the charge, and weaknesse of the inference from it; for sure an Authour may use compounded words, (yea and words of his own making, as, I suppose, St Paul's ἐλαχιστότερος is acknowledged to be, and yet many of these recited from those Epistles are not) without the crime of affectation, as well as St Paul might his ἐθνευομάχησα, θεομάχοι, and the like: and though a holy Martyr in his chains may not be allowed the vanity of affectation as that hunts for glory from men, yet sure he may be allowed to have elevated affections, and by the command of them, to use expressions which are not vulgar & ordinary. The second is his barbarous words, ἀκκητῆα, δεπόςσια, δεσέσιως, ἐξεμπλδειον, which indeed are Latine words made Greek, but so there are many more in the New Testament, in stead of those four charged on Ignatius as barbarismes, these fifteen which are ready at hand to me, (I will not take the pains to seek for others) μίλιον, ἀσάδειον, κήνσος, κοδερῆης, δηνάειον, λεγέων, περιώλειον, κυσώδια, σπεκυλάτωρ, κενύειών, φεγάλλιον, Ιυσός, κολωνία, μάκελλον, μεμβράνα, and many as Latinizing (i.e. barbarous) phrases, ἱκανον ποιεῖν, ἔχειν παρῆσημόιον, λαβεῖν τὸ ἱκανον, συῶφι, δὲς ἐργασίαν, and the like. And 'tis a little strange how this learned man hath minced this matter, confessing indeed that there is δηνάειον in the Gospel (naming only one of so great a number) and δηλαδὸς εἶναι in Hegeῖσιππος: and for the excuse of that one word in Hegeῖσιππος, adding that he was at Rome from the year 150 to 170. whereas this liberty might be allowed either Ignatius, or Hegeῖσιππος, without having been so long at Rome, as well as the Writers of the New Testament, which have three times more of such words then he cites out of both of them. The third is, severall passages, quæ incommode dicta videri possunt, which may seem incommodiously spoken, (and if it be but [seem,] and that but [may seem,] and at last but [incommodiously spoken,] sure this charge will not wound deep) & comparationes non exactæ ad amussim, comparisons not drawn by the rule exactil, (and truly the Martyr that was not to be permitted to have the vanity to affect, might as well be thought not to have the

Euseb. l. 3.  
cap. 27.

the leasure to take the line and the plummet, and delineate every expression so exactly. But what are the miscarriages, and defects in this kinde? why, that he calls the Spirit *αἰνῶν* a cord, and Faith *ἀγῶν* the Leader, whence, saith he, in Ignatius's esteem, *Fidei potior quam Spiritus functio*, Faith hath a nobler office then the Spirit. But why may not I more truly say, that the advantage in that comparison is given to the Spirit, because that is said to draw, when Faith doth lead only? 'Tis certainly clear that his anger was very causeless, who could quarrell at that doctrine, which is in effect no more then this, That the Word of God apprehended by Faith doth lead us our way to heaven, and the Spirit of God is the cord to draw us thither. 2. That he calls his bands *σπινθηρὰ μαρτυρίας* & *ἡ ζωὴ ἀνάστροφας*, spiritual jewels, in which he wishes he might rise, whereas, saith Blondel, there is nothing properly spiritual in the bands which wicked men put on the body of a martyr, and no hope that he should rise in those bands. But sure his sufferings may be called his bands, and those be matter of joy, and *ἀγαλλίας* to his Spirit, more then all the Gemmes to the most vain glorious worldling, and this be very commodiously exprest by those words, and then sure he might wish, (though not hope) (and *ζωὴ* is no more) to have this matter of joy continued to him, and so that he might rise with them. 3. That he uses *αἰνῶν*, and *πνευματικὸς* so oft, What a cruelty upon a patient Martyr is this, not to give him leave to use such frequent innocent words as these frequently, as well as St Paul is allowed the very same, & *ἰσχυρὸς* and *πνευματικὸς*, &c. these are certainly streined exceptions, the learned man was at great leasure to quarell, when this provocation was accepted. 4. That when Baptisme is called *ἡ ἀσπίς* weapons, he calls Faith *ἡ περικεφαλὴ* as an helmet; love, *ἡ φόβος* as a fear; patience, *ἡ ἀντοχή* as a compleat armour. For what, saith he, doth faith and love, &c. confer to him that is already armed by baptisme? and if patience be the Christians compleat armour, what new advantage hath he by having a helmet from faith? but why may not Baptisme be called weapons in the plural, and every of those graces professed and vowed in baptisme, have their severall uses in the after life? and sure the armour of baptisme is not so perfectly of proof, but that there is need of the exercise of every one of those Christian Fide & galearo?

E

virtues

virtues to hold out against the impressions of *Satan*, which are like to be so oft repeated; and if faith do not defend the head, and charity the heart, and patience and perseverance every part of the body, i.e. every action of the future life, that subtle enemy may chance to wound us mortally. As for the new advantage of faith to him that hath the compleat armour of patience, the Author of that Epistle saith no such thing, but on the other side first requires the helmet of faith, and then the *capacitas* of patience, that sure is the arming of all parts, which were not before armed, and that may go for an addition, as perseverance is to sanctity, and as our Saviour saith of his believers, that he that endureth to the end shall be saved. 5. That 'tis not likely that presently after Ignatius coming into Asia, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons should be ordained *eius rogatu*, at his intreaty, quoad Antiochinos Asinorum gratulatorias Epistolas deferrent, who should carry the gratulatory Epistles of the Asians to the Christians of Antioch. I shall only say to this, 1. That they were ordained to some other end beside this, yet might perform that task also, and that very solemnly. 2. That a probable argument, or a conceived improbability against a narration of a matter of fact (which relies not upon a confluence of all probabilities, but only on the authority of the Relatour) is of all other the most unconvincing; there was nothing ever done 1600 years ago, but a good phantasie will observe some improbability in it, and the matter of fact being still but one, when the possibilities which never did come to passe, are infinite, some one of those possibilities may perhaps become at a distance, to him that knows nothing of the fact (but would perswade others that 'twas never done) tolerably probable also. 3. That he bids follow the Bishop as Christ did his Father; and the Presbytery, ut Apostolos, as the Apostles, and saith that he that doth any thing clancularly without the Bishops knowledge, is to be thought *diabolicus* & *hæreticus*, to serve the Devil; whereupon, saith he, *An Episcopus ullos Presbyterorum comparatione Dominus, imo Deus à Christi martyre habitus credere par est?* Is it fit to believe that any Bishops in comparison to Presbyters should be counted Lords, yea Gods by that Martyr of Christ? But sure this is to pervert and torment the sense of that Martyr; For to bid follow Bishops as Christ did his Father, is far enough from making Lords or Gods



of them: nay if the comparison were bound to hold that way, it were more proper to prove the *Isidore*, or equality of *Bishops and Presbyters*, for sure Christ was equal with his Father: and 'tis observable that in the place of *Polycarp* set down by this learned man, p. 15. when obedience is required to *Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Christ*, he finds no fault with it, though that be the very thing actually said by *Polycarp of Presbyters and Deacons*, that here he unjustly first imposes on, then accuses in *Ignatius's* words of *Bishops*, which yet are, onely for the manner of performing the obedience due to *Bishops*, as *Christ* obeyed his Father, and cannot be extended to any equalizing the *Bishop* to *God*, or the least appearance of doing so. 'Twere too long to go thorow, and render formal answers to the rest of the heap of exceptions, which are every one single to flight, and of no value (and consequently the totall of them will not amount any higher, it being not in the power of 1000 probabilities to become one demonstration, or to be equipollent to one, much lesse of a few slight improbables) that 'tis clear the number of the exceptions was the thing depended on, and not the weight of them: Witnesse these four more, that shut up the rear, 1. That he saith that *all pious men are changed in ray*, *Quia* into a new leaven, which he thinks inconvenient, when *S. Paul* calls the *Body of Quia*, unleavened, whereas *Christ* being by *Ignatius* in the next words expressed to be that *Quia* new leaven; there is then nothing fit to be quarrel'd in it, unlesse to grow in grace, and the practise of all *Christian* duties (which is the meaning of that expression) being an inconvenient advise. 2. That he bids fly to the *Apostles* as *πρωτοκλητοις* & *ἐκκλησιας*, as to the *Presbytery* of the Church, whereon having resolved that by the *Apostles* he must mean the *Apostles writings*, (because in the ninth of *Trajan* then past all the *Apostles* were dead) he concludes that the *Author* of that saying makes no more of the *Apostles writings*, then of the *Congregations* of men subject to error. Where in all sober reason and equality, if the *Apostles* signifie the *Apostles writings*, then the *πρωτοκλητοις ἐκκλησιας* need not signifie any other latter *Presbytery*, but those *Apostles* themselves, who when they wrote those writings, were the *Christian* *Sanket-in*, or *Presbytery* of the Church, which was to decide all their controversies in Religion.

3. That writing to Polycarp, *tanquam ad plebeum nescio quem*, as was an ordinary person, he saith, *et tunc illi non scribit, obsecro* your Bishop: as if forsooth the Epistle written to Polycarp might not be written to the Church under him also, to whom 'tis clear that plural precept [*scribitis*] must belong, and not to any one man, though he were never such a plebeian. 4. That he saith he will suffer, nay, if they will not, force the wild beasts to kill him, which saith he is like the *desperabunda seculi mancipia*, the most desperate slaves among the heathen. As if these fervent expressions of desire to suffer for Christ were thus to be deformed, and charged against a pious man. After all this unprovoked severity, one act of grace and mercy these Epistles are vouchsafed from this Author, viz. that he contains himself from making use of one passage which *suppositionis eorum argumentum videri possit*, might seem an argument of the supposition's false of them; (and yet no greater an argument then that [*multa quæ incommode dicta videri possunt*] made up a great number of arguments even now) the passage is, that he disputed professedly against the Arians; those that affirm'd Christ's humanity to have been but an appearance, no reality; for saith he, whether you make Cassian with Baronius, or Saturninus, Basilides, and Valentinus the antesignans Docetarian, the principal Authors of that heresie, these being under Adrian and Antoninus Pius, will appear to be after Ignatius: having gone thus far, he comes off again, with a *Volens hoc argumento abstinere*, he willingly abstains from using this argument; because saith he, Simon Magus was before Ignatius, and he, saith Irenæus, taught this doctrine of Christ's appearing only, not being a true man; and that Cassian, &c. were call'd the chief of them, must signifie, not that they were the first broachers, but in their times the chief maintainers and abettors of that heresie. This mercy, I confesse, was but seasonable, and had much of justice in it, and shews that that Author was able to have answered his other arguments, if he had so pleased, particularly that which is made use of so confidently both by him and Salmasius of Eryx, the Valentinian dialect, which is by Isaacus Vossius satisfied with this very answer which here Blondel gives to the use of the word Arian, viz. that Valentinus was not the first that said *ἀβυσσὸς καὶ ὀρύς ὀρίων*, but that 'tis agreed on by the Antients, that he was not the founder of a new, but reviver of an

an old opinion *non deus in istis xristianis* *substantia* *potest*  
*esse in illis*, faith *Irenaeus*, and other Fathers to the same pur-  
 pose as *Isaacus Vossius* hath collected their affirmations in his  
 Annot. on the place. Having gone thus far in rejecting these  
 Epistles, he is at last at leisure to remember and acknowledge,  
*Plenum illis ipsis, quae consilias putamus Epistolae, fidentibere Patres,*  
*that the Fathers* (Indefinitely, if not universally, and it seems he  
 had no one to produce to the contrary, if he had, he would  
 certainly have produced it, and with reason have depended on  
 it more, then all these other *Topicks*) *afforded a full plenary belief*  
*to these very Epistles*, which the two *Champions* of the age *Salma-*  
*sus* and he think to be *supposititious*, [*putamus*] Is but a poor word,  
*Salmasius* could speak bigger on weaker or fewer arguments,  
 [*iam certo scio, quam me hac scribere.*] To this authority of the  
 Fathers against his opinion, his answer is short, but hath much  
 weight and asperity in it (which they that have as strong an  
 appetite to lay the *Presbyterians* flat, as the *Presbyterians* have ex-  
 press to destroy the *Bishops*, they that have the same exceptions  
 against all distinction, or discrimination of *Lay* and *Clergy*, as  
*Blondel* and *Salmasius* have against the imparity and inequality  
 of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, will, when they can hope to be heard,  
 be ready enough to make use of, and must not be denied to have  
 urged an argument *ad homines* unanswerable, whensoever they  
 shall please to make use of it) and 'tis but this, *Quid tum?*  
*What then?* the authority of the Fathers in a matter of fact (as  
 that *Ignatius* wrote these Epistles) cast off without any ceremo-  
 ny, or difficulty in two syllables. And the reason for so doing,  
 which is added will help the matter but little; *Quam multa*  
*minime suspicaces ac imparatos & sefellerrunt semper, & quotidie*  
*fallunt!* How many things have alwayes deceived, and daily do  
 deceive men that are not suspicious, nor upon their guard? And if  
 all the Fathers of the Church, beginning from those that were  
 nearest *Ignatius's* time, must be involved in the number of these  
 incautious, cheatable men, I shall be afraid to mention the con-  
 sequences, that will too readily be deducible from hence. I shal  
 only say; May not this liberty, or licence rather, be soon ex-  
 tended very inordinately to the invasion of the sacred *Canon* of  
 Scripture? Nay, when the same current, and consent of Fa-  
 thers.

thers, which delivers down all the books which make up our Canon of Scripture, for Canonical, and Theopneust, shall be found at the same time to deliver down, and make use of these *Epistles of Ignatius*, onely with the distinction of *Apocryphal*, (and mean by that, not *supposititious* books, or books which are under suspicion that they are not their off-spring, whom they call Father, but only books of inferior authority, as *Apocryphal* is opposed *tois & tals yevous*, to the books of divine Scripture, & *logi Domini*, to the Law or word of God, & *tois kanonikous* to those that are put in the Canon, and in a word, *ta & tals Arizopha*, as you may see in the end of Nicephorus's *Chronography*, and in others, *inter scripta novi Testamenti noni apocrypha*, numbred among the *apocryphal* books, not of *Ignatius*, but of the New Testament, and appointed to be read by pious men, though not allowed that same authority and dignity, in which the books of Sacred Scripture have been justly esteemed) when, I say, the same hands of the ancient Church shall deliver both the *Epistles of St Peter* for Divine Scripture, and these *Epistles of Ignatius* for the *Epistles of Ignatius*, though not for Divine Scripture, who can say that *Salmasius* when he had thus confidently thrown off these *Epistles* from being written by *Ignatius*, did not consequently, and agreeably to his *repulse* in throwing off one of *St Peters Epistles* also? And who can think it reasonable that our wariness and censoriousness shall enable us at 1500 years distance to judge more truly of a matter of fact, (which none but they that are near, be they never so wary, and suspicious, can discern anything of) then they that lived in those times which were nearest to the scene of action? Nay, how much more rational is that of the same *Salmasius*? who in the controversy about the parts of the Croffe, i.e. when he conceiv'd antiquity to be favourable to that opinion which he defended, hath made this argumentative against his adversaries, *An credibile est Gregorium qui vixit tanto tempore postquam crucis supplicio nemo amplius afficebatur, certiores esse testes de habitu crucis totius, &c. quam eos autores qui scripsere cum adhuc passim in usu esset communissimo nocendum crucifixio?* Is it credible, that he that lived so long after the use of that kind of death was left off, should be a surer witness of any thing that belongs to it, then those Authors that wrote when it

J. Wal.  
Messalin,

was in use? De Cruce, p. 253. And again, if *Blondel* may say without proof, that the *Fathers* were incontinent in general, and thence conclude, that they were actually deceived in this particular; Why may not I as reasonably affirm (having given my reasons, when he hath not) that *Blondel* is too censorious, and partial, and willing to bring all to the cause he hath espoused, and thence conclude (knowing how contrary these *Epistles* are to his interests) that he hath actually express his passion, and injustice in this causeless censure of these *Epistles*? I have done with this learned mans observations in this matter, and when I shall hear of any other argument which can seem of force against these *Epistles*, I shall be glad to consider it, professing my self to conceive, that as long as that one *Author* stands in the Church in his just value, the cause of *Prelacy* and *Hierarchy* cannot want supports; every page almost of those *Epistles* being sufficient (which the adversaries acknowledge in saying he doth *invalens analogus in season and out of season*, at all turns assert *Episcopacy*) to interpret the obscurer vestigia in the *New Testament*, and to assure us what was the practise and doctrine of the *Apostles* and *Primitive Churches* in that point; and that is the reason I have insisted so long on a thing which may seem so extrinsecall to my first undertaking, and shall not think my self out of my way, if I be content to return to this controversy again. (as having such an immediate influence on the cause in hand) whensoever I shall be call'd to it; In the mean, I shall content my self with this view of that matter; and for the present, as I cannot but conceive it rashness to cast an *Epistle* of *St. Peter* upon a bare affirmation in a *Parentesis* (*que sola plane genuina est*) so will it be in a lower degree, but in like manner, to deal with a most ancient *Apostolical* spirited volum, upon such unproved censures as these; and it is observable, that the first writer that ever undertook to be thus severe against that whole volume of *Epistles*, did with as much confidence, and as little pretention to argument, cast off one of the books of *Canonical Scripture*. This I thought not amiss here to insert, to vindicate the writings of that ancient Martyr, though it may be taken for a *parenthesis* in this place.

Supposing then this writer to stand in the same repute in the

Sect. 5.



the Church of God, in which he did, before he was observed to be unreconcilable with the designs of the new Reformers, I shall proceed to make use of his testimony. He commands obedience to be paid to Bishops & Archbishops, as to the Apostles; to the Presbyters as to the Seventy, to the Deacons, as to the Deacons in the Acts. The passage is known, and although in another place, he makes the Presbyters parallel to the Apostles, and the Bishops to Christ, yet these places are easily reconciled, it being clear, that that latter place considers the Apostles at the time, when Christ was here on earth, at which time they were indeed but a second rank (and in that respect it is that Origen saith, Tr. in Mat. 24. *Propter Episcopum Dominus Jesus est, Presbyteri Apostoli*, Christ is properly the Bishop, and the Apostles Presbyters) but the former place considering that after Christs departure, is that which more properly belongs to this matter; this power (though promised before) being not yet inflated on them, till after his resurrection, immediately before his leaving of this world (or indeed till the coming of the Holy Ghost) at which time they were left the Governors of the Church, as Christ had been before, and the Bishops, their successors ever since. To which purpose St. Cyprian, Ep. 65. *Apostoli, i.e. Episcopi & Praepositi Dominus elegit*, the Lord chose Apostles, i.e. Bishops and Governors. So Judas's Apostolical function is called *omnis uero Bishoprick Act. 1. 29* so Theodoret thinks Epiphroditus was Bishop of the Philippians, because he is called *Artaxerxes Apostle*, and on 1 Tim. 3. saith this, *οὗτοι καὶ οὐκ ἀποστόλοι, ἀλλ' ἐπίσκοποι ὡς ὁ κύριος ἡμετέρος, οἱ ὁποῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἀποστόλοι, ἀλλ' ἐπίσκοποι ὡς ὁ κύριος ἡμετέρος*, those that are now call'd Bishops, they then call'd Apostles, in Titus, saith he, and so Apollon, and so (saith Romig. on 1 Cor. 4.) Sosthenes also. Thus St. Hilary frequently calls St. Paul *Episcopus*, Bishop. And Hieronimus Sardus in Eph. *Apostoli Episcopi sunt*, the Apostles are Bishops. So the Scriptor qu. in vet. & nov. Test. qu. 27. *Nemo ignorat Episcopos Servatorem Ecclesiarum instituisse, ipse enim priusquam in caelos ascenderet, imponens manum Apostolis, ordinavit eos Episcopos*. No man is ignorant that our Saviour instituted Bishops over the Churches. For he himself before he ascended to heaven, laying his hand on the Apostles ordained them Bishops. So saith Rabanus Maur. in 1 Tim. 4. 14. of the Apostles times, *Episcopi provincias integras regabant, Apostolorum nomine nuncupati*. The Bishops were call'd Apostles.

So



So doth Blondel himself confesse not only out of *Gildas*, that *St. Matthew* *Episcopatum sortitus est*, *ma Bishop*, but acknowledges it of *St. James* the brother of the Lord, as the voice of all antiquity, that he was *Bishop of Jerusalem*. *Jacobum Hierosol. Ecclesie Episcopatum constanter asserunt veteres omnes. Apol. pro Seat. Hieron. p. 50.* And if it be said, that he meant by the word *Episcopus* *Bishop*, no more then a *Presbyter*, one of many, I shall only then put him or the Reader in minde, what the same Blondel in his censure of the *Pontif. Epistles* (when they say he was not so severe against *Bishops*) hath put together of *St. James. Hierosol. Ecclesiam rexisse statuunt veteres, & Christi Episcopale munus accepisse, ait Hegesippus apud Hieron. in Cat. Epiphan. lib. 78. Hieron. in Gal. c. 1. Greg. Turon. l. 1. c. 17. Nic. Melhon. de pame consec. Christi & Apostolic. Euf. l. 1. c. 19. Constit. l. 8. c. 35. Ab Apostolic. Constit. l. 7. c. 48. l. 8. c. 44. Clem. Alexand. apud Euseb. l. 2. c. 1. Athanas. in Synop. Euseb. l. 2. c. 2. Hieronymus de Script. Eccl. Beda de 6. etat. & Martyrol. ad Cal. Maii. & Chron. Gr. anon. Scriptor. & in Bede. & in Greg. Turon. acknowledging all, that as *Bishop* he governed that Church, as a single person, sat in the see or throne, all the difference between the Antients being whether by *Christ* or the *Apostles*, or both, or by *St. Peter* only, he was ordained *Bishop*.*

<sup>a</sup> The same author in his Chron. p. 43. affirms that he was by the Apostles ordained Bishop of Jerusalem, the nineteenth year of Tiberius, i.e. the very next year in his account after the death of Christ.

Thus, saith *St. Chrys.* did *Christ* invest the *Apostles* with this power of retaining and remitting sins, *under the fig. of a King*, as when a King sends *Governors* over *Provinces*, he gives them power of imprisoning and releasing, intimating the *deacons* or *Rulers* of the Church to be the men that are here represented by the *Apostles*, and so in *L. 3. xi. 14. 15.* speaking of the weighty office of *Bishops* (to excuse himself, who had fled from it) he principally insists on the power which is intrusted to them, and in that respect applies to them the style of the faithful and wise *Servant*, whom *God* makes *Ruler* over his household. So *Theophylact* on *Matth. 18.* *Ἰσχυρὶ ἐξουσίᾳ ἀποτρεῖ καὶ δεσπόζει ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁ ἀποστόλος.* They that after the manner of *St. Peter*, are vouchsafed the honor of being *Bishops*, have the power of binding and loosing. So again appears by the forecited Testimonies of the *Antients*, *Presidents* in *St. Chrys.* and the *explanations* *wealden* *Præfatus* of the Church, in *Theophylact.* And to

*Secl. 6.*  
<sup>a</sup> Hom. 86. in Joh.

282

in the name and sense of the Greek Church, *Gabriel of Philadelphia*, as *St. Iren.* in his second difference between the Greek and the Roman Church, *Of Symon and Iudas*, *Ep. ad Romanos*, *de Exord.* The chief Priests, i.e. Bishops, are the successors of the Apostles; and in plain words, *ἐκ παλαιῆς ἑκείνης ἀποστολῆς ἵνα διαδοῖται*, so that 'tis manifest, that the Apostles were Bishops, and applies to them that of the Psalmist, *Psal. 45. 16.* of Gods constituting them rulers over all the earth, and names the severall Churches wherein the severall Apostles ordain'd Bishops, *St. John in Asia, St. Andrew in Achaia, St. Thomas in India, &c.*

Sec. 7.

Thus also among the Latines *St. Jerome* who was not very favourable to Bishops, saith expressly that they were the Apostles successors, *Episcopi omnes Apostolorum successores sunt. Ep. 83. ad Eustochium.* So *St. Ambrose*, *Claves illas regni celorum in beato Petro Apostolo cuncti suscepimus sacerdotes.* All we, that are styled Sacerdotes, in the blessed Apostle *St. Peter* received the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven. And what *Sacerdos* signifies among the Writers of that time, and particularly in *St. Ambrose*, the observation of any diligent Reader will instruct him; viz. that which the [*suscepimus*] applied to *St. Ambrose's* person, will inforce, he being Bishop of *Milain* at that time, (and this is agreeable even to the heathens acception of the phrase, who use *Sacerdos* and *Pontifex* promiscuously, witness *Servius in En. 3.*) So *de dignitate Sacerdotis. c. 2.* he shews out of Scripture, that the sheep are delivered *Sacerdotibus*, I shall render it to Bishops; because it follows; and so must be subject to those Rulers. So in *St. Chrys.* in the fore-cited *serm. 1. 2.* The word *rex* (which together with *Pastor* in Latine, is ordinarily the Bishops Title, in order to the Shepherds office of ruling, and governing, as well as feeding the flock) and *Sacerdos* are promiscuously taken, and the latter by the Interpreter there rendered *Episcopus*, Bishop.

Sec. 8.

And to the same purpose most clearly *St. Cyprian*, *Ep. 12.* speaking of the Lapsi, those who having fallen were under the censures of the Church, and how the Presbyters had presumed to reconcile, or absolve them, he concludes that they did not (*Reservare Episcopo honorem Sacerdotii sui, & Cathedra* (reserve

to the Bishop the honour of his Priesthood, and chaire, shewing the indifferent use of these words *Episcopus* and *Sacerdos* at that time, and that in opposition to *Presbyter*, appropriating to the one the Power of the Keyes, exclusively to the other. This he had set down more plainly before *Epist.* shewing and aggravating the greatnesse of the fault of those *Presbyters* that had taken upon them to use the Keyes in that case. *Propositum sub Episcopum non cogitantes*, not thinking that there was a Bishop set over them; *quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est*, resolving that it was a fact without any precedent in the Church; and again, *L. 1. Epist. 3.* having proved the Episcopal power to be immediately from God, he expresseth it in these words, *Sacerdotis auctoritas & potestas divina dignatione firmatur*, The Sacerdotal power is settled by divine dignation, and adds the occasion of all Schismes in the Church to be, *quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur*, that the Bishop is not obeyed. *Nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos*, & ad tempus *Judex*, *nunc Christi cogitur*; and that is not considered, that the *unus* Priest, i. e. Bishop and Judge, is for the time in the Church in *Christi* head; which is yet more clear by his making *Sacerdotum Collegium*, The Colledge of Priests, all one with *Coepiscoporum consensus*, The consent of Fellow-bishops, and presently adding, that he that sets himself above this *unus Sacerdos*, one Priest, *se non Episcopi, sed Dei Judicem foret*, makes himself Judge not of the Bishop, but of God. And therefore 'tis a strange proof of Blondels, that Episcopacy and Presbytery is all one; from that speech of *Pontius Diaconus* concerning this *Cyprian*, *Quod ad officium Sacerdotii & Episcopatus gradum novellus electus est*, having before said, *Presbyterium & Sacerdotium statim accepisse*. Whereas the equipollence of the word *Sacerdos* and *Episcopus* being observed, and the difference of *Presbyter* from them doth clearly infer the contrary; and that is apparent by the very place, *Multa sunt quae jam Presbyter fecit; ad probationem bonorum operum satis est, quod ad officium Sacerdotii & Episcopatus gradum adhuc novellus electus est*. He was it seems a *Presbyter* first, and did many things in that state; and a proof that he did so, was his election to the office of *Sacerdos* or Bishop, when he was a novice, then presently or soon after his conversion, where the difference of his being a *Presbyter* and a Bishop is most manifest. So when *S. Hilarius Pictav.* b in *Psalm.*



nothing without the Father, so you also without the Bishop; You, whether Presbyter, or Deacon, or Laick. Once more in *Epist. ad Smyrn.* *ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἀρχιεπίσκόπῳ ὡς τῷ βασιλεὺς.* Let no man without the Bishop do any of those things which belong unto the Church. And the Council of Laodicea hath (almost in Ignatius's words) commanded the same. *Can. 36. τὸ πρεσβύτερον μὴ μὴ ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι ποιῇ.* The Presbyters must do nothing without the consent of the Bishop, and many more acts and Canons might be produced to the same purpose.

And if against all these, this exception be made, that by the force of such Rules not only the power of the Keyes, but also all other power belonging to the Church is appropriated to Bishops; to this the Answer (as it will be easie, so it) will tend much to the clearing, and serve for the shutting up of this whole matter; That indeed there is great truth in the objection, that all power in all matters Ecclesiastical did primarily belong to the Bishop, and no others, even Presbyters themselves; but as it was by the Bishop communicated to them, not only by that first act of Ordination; in giving them the *κλεις*, or first power, but also by a second act necessary to give them that other power to use or exercise that power, when they have it.

Sect. 12.

This is the plain sense of the Canon of the Council of Arles, *Can. 19. nec Presbyteris civitatis sine Episcopi precepto amplius aliquid imperare; vel sine auctoritate literarum ejus in unaquaque Parochia aliquid agere.* The Presbyters of any City must not command any thing without the precept of the Bishop; nor do any thing in any Parish, without authority of the Bishops letters licensing them to do it. Thus, I say, it is not only for the power of the Keyes, but even for the Sacraments. Ignatius's saying last produced in *Epist. ad Smyrn.* is by him thus enlarged. *ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτῷ ἑαυτῷ.* Let that Eucharist be reputed firm (or rightly celebrated) which is done by the Bishop, or by him to whom he shall give leave; and for Baptisme, and that together, *ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτῷ ἑαυτῷ.* It is not lawfull without the Bishop, i. e. without his leave either to baptize, or administer the Sacrament, *ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτῷ ἑαυτῷ.* but when he shall think fit according to Gods pleasure, *ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτῷ ἑαυτῷ.* that all that you do, may

Sect. 13.



be safe and firme. It seems the consent of the Bishop was thought necessary to make it safe for any Presbyter to doe any Ecclesiastical act, not to give validity to it, when 'twas done by him. So Tertul. de cor. mil. *Non de aliorum quam de presidentium manu Eucharistiam sumimus*; We receive the Eucharist from none but the Presidents or Governors. They are all one with the *episcopus*; in Just. Mart. Apol. 2. to whom that whole business is there committed. So again Tertul. de bapt. *Dubium baptismum jar habet Sacerdos unus Sacerdos qui est Episcopus, ubi sunt Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi autoritate, propter Ecclesie unitatem, quo salvo salva pax est.* The Chief Priest who is the Bishop, hath the power of giving baptisme, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Bishop, for the honor of the Church; which as long as it is preserved, the peace of the Church will be preserved also. So when the Script. *anot. quest. in V. & Nov. Test.* which is thought to be Hilary, saith, *In Alexandria & per totam Aegyptum, si desit Episcopus, consecrat Presbyter; ut in Alexandria et Aegypti, si there be no Bishop, the Presbyter consecrates.* 'tis clear by the mention of that liberty in the Presbyter, as of a thing peculiar to Egypt, and that too, only when there is no Bishop present, that regularly this power belonged to none but the Bishop; and to those Presbyters to whom he gave it. Where by the way will appear

\* *Sive baptizatorum confirmatio, sive penitentium benedictio, sive ordinandorum consecratio.*

Blond. Apol. p.

57. & Salmaf.

in appar. ad l.

de Prim. Pape.

\* *Sive de Eucharistie conse-*

*cratone, sive de*

*Chrismatione,*

*sive de ordina-*

*tionibus sacris*

*interpretari*

*placet.*

a great mistake of Blondel and (I suppose out of him, as his many other Notes in his apparatus against Bishops) of Salmasius, who in another place of Hilary in *Eph. 4.* cited by both of them, [*quod Aegyptum Presbyteri consecrant, si presens non sit Episcopus*], In Egypt the Presbyters consecrate, if the Bishop be not present interpret consecrating, either to be confirmation or blessing (I suppose absolving) of penitents, or ordination. It being clear by the other place, just now cited, that *consecratio* signifies there consecrating of the Sacrament, which is peculiarly call'd consecration, that of giving orders being ordination, not as he calls it ordinarum consecratio (which what it would grammatically signifye I know not, unless some benediction of them that are offer to be ordain'd) and it seems <sup>d</sup> Blondel himself, p. 61. thinks it possible that *consecratio* may signifye the consecrating the Elements, and by what follows, I conceive him to use it in that sense, saying, *quod antiquis per solam Episcoporum absentiam licuit, omnibus*

nunc



pure absolute licet, that which anciently was made lawful to all (i. e. to Presbyters) only by the Bishops absence, is now wholly lawful to all; Which I suppose he must mean of consecrating the Sacrament, and I am sure could not reasonably believe of ordination. But this by the way, in passage, to confirm that assertion of Ignatius sufficiently, that the Church was by the Apostles put into the hands of Bishops, that ordinarily the consent of the Bishop was required to enable a Presbyter for any Ecclesiastical act, the plenitude of power being by Christ delivered down to the Apostles, and through them to their successors Bishops, and by them dispens out to others in that measure, and those portions, which they should think fit.

And if it be demanded here, What it is which in our Church is given to Presbyters in their Ordination, as the full importance of the form then used [*Receive the Holy Ghost*] I answer, not all that is at any time contained under that phrase, when it is used in the consecration, but only the particulars which are after mentioned; and so distinctly not the power of ordaining, which is not mentioned; and which is a particular, that never was regular for any Presbyter in the ancient Church to assume to himself, or to any number of that order without a Bishop over them (and it would not be hard to give an account of all that hath been produced of late by *Salmasius*, or any other from the *origines Alexandrini*, or any other record of antiquity to the contrary, but that it is *illius ordinis* and would be too large a *disputatio* in this place;) and if the practice of some few Protestant Churches in this last Century be opposed against it; then 1. I shall conceive those very unfit to be confronted against the Universal for 1500 years, and therefore secondly, I shall not doubt to affirm, that want is not only a defect, but a corruption among them. Thirdly, it will be observable, that even those that want it among them, have formerly thought fit to excuse it by the case of necessity, and to acknowledge it their infelicity, but not their fault, (their superiors in the State not permitting them to have Bishops to ordain them;) and to give their judgements freely, that where Episcopacy is, it is to be preserved; and where it is not, it is to be wished for; which is a sufficient expression of their sense of it. And if the *improsperous* state of the cause of late in this

Sec. 14.

King-

Kingdome hath moved some of them to change their style, I suppose there is no greater reason to depend on their judgments who are mov'd or wrought on by such *extrinsecal* arguments, then on his, who lately made no scruple to confesse, in giving his opinion of *H. Grotius*, *Ego non probo prudentiam minus felicem*. He lik'd not the choice of that side which was not proper. And then fourthly, that this cannot be applicable by way of excuse to those who desire to cast out Bishops where they are on purpose that Presbyters may usurp the power which belongs to them. Secondly, not al power of binding and loosing, retaining or remitting, though those words are there added (*whose sins you do remit, &c.*) but so much as the Bishops or Governors are presumed to have thought fit to impart to them, and what that is, will appear by other acts of our Church, especially by the Liturgy: as 1. The declaring of absolution in the Church after the Confession of sins; 2. The absolving them by way of prayer before the Sacrament (in case the Bishop be not present) and 3. in Baptismal washing, and 4. upon speciall Confession on the sick-bed; or any time else which may by analogy or reduction come under these same heads, as in the case of private conference, and confession at other times: In all these the remitting of sins is allowed among us to a bare Presbyter, not only by way of pronouncing, or declaring of absolution, but (as a ministerial act) actually absolving him, (by Christs authority committed to the Presbyters) from all his sins.

Seet. 15.

All which yet will not extend to the absolving from the band of Excommunication, or proportionably to such power of binding, any further (at most) then to confer the first power of it, which if it be then given, doth yet remain (as the other power of Preaching, and administering the Sacraments) bound and restrained from being exercised, till they be further loosed by the donation of a second power, as Luke 24. 49. when Christ sent them the Promise of his Father, which was at the time of his breathing on them, Job. 20. 22. and gave them a *uideretur*, a *grace*, or first power of it, he yet restrains the exercise of it, till the actual descent of the Holy Ghost, (but tarry you in Jerusalem till you be indued with power from above) and that is not done in this Church as it stands established by Law, (in this particular

of



*idque dicendi, &c.* The truth of which, I shall, with all due respect, for a while take boldnesse to examine. First, by yielding, or for the present not denying, that there was or might be an office or power among the *Jews* intrusted to some select *Elders* of the people, of teaching and giving publique responses (by way of deciding cases of *Conscience*, though not by way of *Judicature*) what was to be accounted *lawful*, what not, both by the Law of God, and the Tradition of the *Antients*; which yet being supposed and granted, I must secondly interpose, that it is not thereby proved that this is called in the *Talmud*, or by any of those writers, the power of binding and loosing, (or that the power of binding and loosing is by them so described) but (which is quite another thing, *לשון הוראה* a power of teaching or instructing, &c. what is lawful, what forbidden. Nor will it be a proof of any force to conclude (that which we have no reason to believe without a proof, or some kinde of affinity in the phrases, *viz.*) that this power of binding is that power of teaching, and no more, only because there was such a power of teaching among the *Jews*. For if we will judge *a pari*, experience proves the contrary, in this Church of ours; where though there be a power of binding, and a *munus docendi*, an office of teaching, &c. yet no man is bound from thence to acknowledge these two to be all one, but we have long believed them to be two faculties, or offices, the one given the *Apostles* in the donation of the Keys, the other in the mission to preach; (and though it were granted that we were mistaken in affirming them to be two such distinct faculties, yet would not that hinder the truth of this assertion, that in our booke they are so distinguished; the question being now of the fact, & not of the right, and it being clear that in our practice our Preaching is one thing, and our Excommunicating is another) and secondly, because 'tis clear, there were two distinct powers among the *Jews*, one of declaring in *foro*, as well as the other *extra forum*, one judicial, as well as the other doctrinal; and sure it would be but a poore *superseas*, or prohibition to keep the *Sanhedrin* among them from judging and punishing any offender brought before them, by telling them that there was among the *Jews* a *לשון הוראה* a licence or faculty of declaring what was lawful, without any power of punishing; For they

they would be soon able to say, that 'twas by some other power (and not by that of declaring) that they undertook thus to judge and punish: and let me add that although the power among the Jews were acknowledged only to be a civil power, yet might Christ in his Church set up an Ecclesiastical power proportionable to that, and imitate that in the sacred, which they used only in civil judicatures, as anon we shall have occasion to demonstrate. And thirdly, the phrase of the Gospel, from whence we pretend, is not the *facultas*, faculty, or power of binding, but the donation of Keyes, and with that, Christ's Promise, that whosoever they shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and therefore I conceive this will not be a convincing way of inferring this conclusion.

We must therefore in the next place proceed to examine the reasons, or arguments produced to persuade us, that the power of binding and loosing is no more then the power of declaring, &c. what is prohibited, what is permitted, the office of the Casuist only. And these reasons I can find to be but two.

Sect. 3.

1. That *ligatum & solutum placet milles in Talmudis ex verisimo sermo Ecclesie illius usu denotat quid verum, quid permittum*. 2. That in some places of Greek Authors, *δένω* and *λύω*, to bind and loose are used also.

Sect. 4. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

For the first of these, I shall first say, that if it were true, that the Idiom of the Talmudists were *ex vetustissimo Ecclesie illius usu*, out of the most antient use of that Church, the Law of Moses, and the Scriptures of the Old Testament, being the Records of the most antient Church, some footsteps of it might be expected there; but I shall suppose there are no such to be found, not only because I have there sought them in vain, but because I presume the Author would have conceived any Testimony from thence to be more Authentick then the Talmud, and so would certainly have produced them if there had been any. Secondly, for the Talmudists' acception of the phrases; first I might say, that we are no way obliged to interpret Greek words in the New Testament by the use of the Talmudists, because though the traditions concerning Hebrew customs mentioned in the Talmud may reasonably be thought antienter then Christ's time (and so the Testimonies brought thence be worth the heeding for

Sect. 5.



such, and fit sometimes to be used for the explaining the like customs mentioned in the *New Testament* ) yet the booke it self, and consequently the word in it (which only we have now to consider) was written, and set out long after the *New Testament*, the *Misnaioth*, or first *Misnaioth*, which contain the *Text of the Talmud*, being set forth by the *Tannaim*, or *Doctores Mischinici*, about the year 150 after *Christ*, who as they profess to have had their beginning per continuum successionem acceptionis legis oralis à *Mose*, saith *Buxtorf*, by a continual succession of tradition of the oral law from the times of *Moses*, so they acknowledge to end in *R. Jehudah hakkadosch*, (stiled *Hannasi*, the Chief or Prince, and by way of eminence Rabbi, when he is cited in the *Gemara* ) who lived under *Antoninus* in the midst of the second Century. After these *Tannaim*, are the *Amoriam* whom *Scaliger* calls *γροικωτοι*, the Authors of the *Gemara*, and of that *Gemara*, i.e. those disputations, and decisions of those learned men at *Jerusalem* together with the *Mischna* forementioned, doth the *Jerusalem-Talmud* consist, and was set forth *an.* 230. as the collection of the like disputations and decisions on the *Mischna*, which were had in *Academia Pumbedithana*, *Soriab*, and *Nabardeab*, make up the *Talmud Babylonicum*, which was completed *an.* 500. This will be sufficient to shew that the words of *Christ*, either as they were spoken by him, or repeated by the *Evangelists*, ought not to be conceived to have imitated the phrases of the *Talmudists* so long after them; and there will be as little reason to believe (what is left the only possible) that the Writers of the *Talmuds* have imitated the phrases in the *Gospel*, being themselves both *Jews* and enemies to the *Christian Religion*; and besides, if the *Idiom* of the *Talmudists* were of any weight in this matter, yet sure it is not sufficient to weigh down the contrary Interpretation of the *Christian Fathers*, (who are to us in all reason to be heeded, as the verier *Talmudists* of the two, the *Traditors* and deliverers of our *Gospel*, and *Creed* unto us ) or the use of it among the *Jews* that have written in *Greek*, particularly of the *Autor of Ecclesiastiew*, who is conceived to be the famous *Ben-Sira*, and with him *adv. dyaslias*, is punctually to forgive *sua*, c. 28. 2. however no way able to extend it self to that other

*1. vld. Buxtorf.*  
*1. 1. Rabb.*  
*p. 283.*



other place in St. John, where the phrase is varied, and the [power of remitting and retaining of sins] is given to the Disciples, which will have no analogy with that which is here pretended; for whatever should be granted of the words *ligatum & solutum*, binding all one with prohibited, &c. the retaining or remitting of sins, will be distant from it, for sure that will not be, to declare one man's sins unlawful, another's lawful, which it must do, if this interpretation be applied to that place also.

This being premised as an Answer sufficient to take away the force, or convincingness of this interpretation, I shall ex abundanti superadd, that I have used som care to examine those words, and to observe their importance in those, and other Jewish writings: I shall give you an account of it.

The Hebrew word for binding is *ḲN*, which I shall make no scruple to acknowledge, doth in the Talmud many times signifie to forbid and prohibit; and from thence *ḲN* and *ḲN* signifies a thing forbidden, prohibited, unlawful; onely by the way I shal crave leave to shew you by what degrees it comes to signifie thus. The word in the Old Testament signifies to bind, (and sure that is the best interpreter of Idioms in the New) and accordingly is rendred by *ḲN*, *ḲN*, *ḲN*, *ḲN*, &c. and is used commonly for binding with cords, and sometimes for that band, or obligation, that proceeds from having made a vow as Numb. 30. 4. and is then rendred *ḲN* definition or decree, because by that vow I bind, or define, or determine my self to such a performance, Farther then this, 'tis true this word is rendred by our Translators, Num. 11. 28. to [forbid] Lord Moses forbid them, where yet 'tis observable that the forbidding there, which Josua desires, is applied to the persons, and not to the thing, and signifies a checking, repressing, [Lord Moses suffered them not, cohibeto eos] as when by chiding, or disciplining, a superior restrains another; according to which use of the word it is, that Philip de Aquin. makes it agree in sense with *ḲN*, and *ḲN* prohibit and cohibuit, forbidding, and repressing: and thus it will be very agreeable with our sense of binding, as that signifies Church-censure, *excoḡmunicatio*, disciplining, repressing offenders by that means. In the whole Scripture I believe there will not one place be found where that word is rendred by the 72. by any word signifying

Sect. 6.

fyng barely to prohibit, or the like, unless you will say it doth Dan. 6. 7, 8, 9. where the word נִדָּן is rendred *Nyua*, and *hagur*, a decree, and yet if you examine that place, and the nature of the decree, you shall finde, that it was not a bare prohibition, but a binding to punishment upon non-performance (for the decree was there, v. 7. that *whosoever shall ask any petition from either God or man, but of thee, O King, shall be cast into the den of lions*) and so the decree is that designation to the punishment of casting into the den, which is there call'd נִדָּן binding, as when the Judge decrees the Offender to be Excommunicated, that act of judicature is a decree, yet nevertheless a binding, (this binding being a judicial act, and from thence receiving its force of obligation) and converso in that a binding, or obligation to punishment; that it is such a decree, to wit, a decree *sub pena*, that such a thing shall be done, so saith Schindler, that the Chaldee נִדָּן is *obligavit ad obedientiam, aut penam*, binding to obedience, or penalty, and Elias Levita, that נִדָּן נִדָּן &c. Every thing from which either sinne or punishment cometh unto him that doth it נִדָּן נִדָּן is said to be bound, or is call'd *Assur*; and therefore Munster giving an account of the use of the word in the Commentaries of the Rabbins, saith נִדָּן or נִדָּן signifies *edictum aut sententiam, quâ quis tenetur*, &c. by which any man is bound to punishment, if he obey it not. In like manner as he that vows, binds, (and the word נִדָּן Num. 30. 4. &c. belongs peculiarly to that) because in vowing he doth either by words of execration explicitly, or else by intimation implicitly, call punishment upon himself, if he perform not his vow, and so binds himself to that punishment. And so still the word [binding] by denoting a decree in this kinde, doth not at all vary from our present sense of binding by way of censure, which now we contend for; but rather confirm and concur with it; and so I conceive (in those excerpts about excommunication, which J. Coch hath set down in Latine out of Maimonides) those words of Maimonides do import, *Quod totus Israel decrevit, non observat Princeps*, &c. What all Israel decreed, the Prince observes not: he speaks of inflicting anathema's, and I shall grant that the word rendred *decrevit*, is in the original נִדָּן the word for binding (in reference to which it follows in the next words, by him set down, *remittitur à Lefo, si ei satisfecerit*, &c.

The

The injur'd person remits, if satisfaction be made him) and from thence shall conclude, that even when it is to be rendred decrevit, it may yet note punishment, particularly that of excommunication, or decree ad excommunicandum, sentence to punishment being a kinde of Legislation, and all binding to that, an act of Command or power.

Sect. 7.

Having thus considered the verb **TON** I shall as freely grant that the participles, or nouns deduced from thence, **TON** and **TON** among the Rabbins or Talmudists, signifie very often a thing forbidden, prohibited, unlawfull (though in the Old Testament again the nouns there used **TON**, and **TON** signifie not so, but are taken in a regular sense, and so rendred by the 72 *Septuaginta* a band, and *Septuaginta* an ordinance or decree, and **TON** *Septuaginta* and *Septuaginta*, bound or imprison'd, and the like, and not the thing unlawfull or prohibited) which yet being granted and added to what was before granted of the Talmudical use of the Verb, comes not home to prove the objecters conclusion, which is this, that the verb **TON** signifies among the Talmudists, *decernere, explicare, interpretari, declarare, de ligato, vel quid ligatum sit, i. e. quid vetitum*: to decern, explicate, interpret, declare concerning a thing bound, or what is bound, i. e. what is forbidden: for to prove this sense of the verb, that other supposed use of the participle is not sufficient, any more then my confessing *amatum* to signifie a thing loved, will conclude me to affirm, that *amo* signifies to declare a thing to be loved, which we know signifies formally to love, and nothing else.

Sect. 8.

That the verb signifies to forbid, or decree, *per modum legislationis* (which is all that could be deduced from these premises, (though supposed true) of *ligatum* in the Talmud signifying nothing but *illicitum*) 'tis acknowledged, but that will not serve the turn, thereby wholly to evacuate & nullifie the power of the Keyes, which is pretended to belong to the Church from these texts; If the Apostles had this power to forbid or decree, this were more then to interpret or declare a thing to be unlawful, the office of making laws is more then that of the Casuist, or Counsellour, or Preacher: and beside, secondly, it would be but reason to suppose those decrees backt with some power of censures against resisters, and so indeed the word imports, to decree

sub.

*sub panâ* under penalty, and not simply to decree. But the thing for which this Talmudical interpretation contends, and which we oppose, is that this power of binding is only a power of declaring, and explaining a thing to be unlawful; and for this from all that is pretended, or offer'd to our view, I have after all my search no temptation to suspect, that even the Talmudists themselves do use the word. The verb with them may signifie [to prohibit] and the nouns, and participle, a thing prohibited, or unlawful, and that is the utmost that Buxtorf could observe of the words among the Talmudists, or that the author of the interpretation offers any proof for [*ligatum & solutum*, i. e. *millies in Talmudicis vetitum lege sacrâ aut permissum*], and if these notions will be taken, then the meaning of [*whatsoever yee shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven*] will be, that *whatsoever they shall by decree prohibit on earth, shall be prohibited, or unlawfull in heaven*; which were only to exchange the power of Censures, for the power of giving Laws, which, as it is more then that of the Casuist, so, I conceive, is never to be found any where without power of punishing also.

Sect. 9.

This I conceive to be answer sufficient to all that is produced, or pretended, even upon supposition that the Talmud were the umpire, or the use of words there the best Nomenclature for the New Testament. But then over and above, we must again remember, that this Talmudical observation will be but little conviction to us, who finde that the writers of the New Testament have no sympathy with the Talmud in this matter, but use variety of other words to expresse [commanding, or decreeing, or forbidding], such are *ἐπιτάττειν, ἐπιβάλλειν, ἐπιτιθεῖναι, καλεῖν, καλῶν, διοικῶναι*, and the like, but never *δίδωαι* or any of that making; and in like manner have other phrases to expresse a thing unlawful, or forbidden, *ἀθέμιτον*, and the like, but never *ἀδικοῦναι*, or any thing like it: neither is it, I conceive, pretended, that these words *δίδωαι* and *ἀδικοῦναι* have any such sense in any other place of the New Testament; but only in these two, which are (parallel one to another, and so) in effect but one, and that the matter of the present controversie, and so a *petitio principii*, when 'tis made use of to confute him that concludes the Censures from thence.

Add

Adde unto these yet farther, that even in the *Talmud* it self Sect. 10. the word *טון* ( of which this observation is made ) signifies *binding* too, and that not only in the obvious vulgar senses, but in that also which we here contend for, of *binding* by *censures*, or *binding* over to *punishment*, ( *obstrinxit ad penam*, as *Schindler* renders the *Chaldee*, and as *Elias Levita* the *Rabbinical* word, *be bound over to punishment* ) and so with great reason may be resolved (even when it signifies to *prohibite*) to belong only to such *penal prohibitions*, or at least, ( belonging at first to such only ) to have fallen after in common use ( which sure hath been observ'd to bend words from their primitive sense ) to signify *various* all kind of *decrees* or *prohibitions*: which surely will not exclude, but contain under it that which we now contend for.

I shall shew the strength of this argument by a parallel, as I conceive, exactly proportion'd to it. *טון* in *Arabick* signifies *millies*, very ordinarily [ to forbid, or resolve any thing to be unlawful, from thence the noun *טון* and *טון* is *vetitum*, any thing *prohibited* or *forbidden*, and *טון* and *טון* *prohibition*; Suppose now in some discourses concerning the kinds or degrees of *excommunication* among the *Jews*, or of the power of the *Sanhedrin*, or indifferently in any *Jewish* writing, I should meet with the word *טון*, and render it in *Latine* *prohibuit*, *interdixit*, and a friend ingenuously admonish me that it ought to be rendred *anathematizavit*, *devovit*; would it be thought reason or ingenuity in me to reply to my admonisher, No, but I have rendred it aright, for in *Arabick* *טון* signifies *prohibuit*, and therefore 'tis but an ignorance in the *Arabick* dialect, to render the *Hebrew* *anathematizavit*, and but a popular error (to be reform'd from hence) in them, that conceive there was any kind of *excommunication* among the *Jews*, meant by that word *טון*; whereas 'tis clear, that word signifies onely *prohibition*, and therefore belongs among the *Jews* only *ad Theologie preceptivæ munus*, or to the office of teaching and interpreting, what is [ *vetitum, vel interdixit lege sacrâ.* ] If, I say, I should deal thus with any peece of plain *Hebrew*, my first question would be, whether this account of my rendring that word would be accepted; and if not, my second now is, whether the



processe of the present arguing hath not done the like, or somewhat more.

Se&. 11.

This wilbe yet clearer, by proceeding to consider the words which are opposit to it, (and to which this Author refers when he saith, *Solutum milles in Talmudicis licitum aut permissum*; A thing loosed is taken a thousand times in the Talmud for lawful or permitted) such are *חֵטְר* and *מֵחֵר* which I also acknowledge to be taken amongst the Talmudists for *licitum* & *permissum*, lawful and unforbidden.

Se&. 12.

Of which yet somewhat must be further observed, 1. That *חֵטְר* from whence they come, in *hiphil* signifies *solvere*, to loose; (as indeed that which hath no obligation laid on it, which is loose from all *band* to obedience, or obligation to punishment, is properly resolv'd to be *lawful*) but then this hinders not, but that the verb in *hiphil* may still signifie, (and indeed even among the Rabbins ordinarily doth) *to loose*, both properly & metaphorically; properly, as to loose or untie those that are bound with cords, or such like bands, properly so called, as Ps. 146. 7. *מֵחֵר יִסְוֶה* *solvit vinctos*, loose those that are bound, & Ps. 105. 20. the king sent *וַיִּתְּרֵם* and loosed them, where the Chaldee paraphrase reads *וַיִּשְׁוֶה* & *solvit eum*, and the 72 *λυωσιν αὐτον*, and Psal. 146. 7. *Dominus מֵחֵר* *qui solvit vinctos*, loosening men out of prison: or metaphorically, and that in a double sense, either as it is applied to doubts, or difficulties, and then 'tis to dissolve them; or to persons, and then 'tis to let loose or unoblige, and in this latter sense J. Coch cites it *ex cap. 1. Nedarim*, that on whom the *anathema* or *cherem* is inflicted *coram*, or in his presence *אֶת מֵחֵר לֹו אֵלֶּה* *it shall not be remitted to him*, but before his face also; where this word signifies clearly *remission* or *absolution*, and that from a sentence of excommunication; so again in that constitution of the law cited by Buxtorf, the word is twice used most clearly in our sense, He that continues in *Niddui* 30 dayes *וְהָיָה בְּקֶשׁ* *and desires not to have it loosed*, they separate him, or put him under *Niddui* again, & if he continue so 30 dayes more, *בְּקֶשׁ לְהַחֲזִירוֹ* *and desires not to have it loosed*, (or as he renders it, *relaxate*) they excommunicate, or put him under *cherem*; & therefore Schindler mentioning *וְהָיָה בְּקֶשׁ* and the Rabbins use of it, renders it simply *solutio*, *loosing*; and there is a saying in *שולחן ערוך* in which it

Ep. Heb. inf. 2.  
p. 57.



it bears this sense. *If any man swear in this form, [If this be true, let me be excommunicate in this world, and in the other] and be perjured, he cannot be absolved by any.*

Another word synonymous to this, and ordinarily used by the Talmudists is *סָלַח*, and that primarily signifying (as the other did) to loose or dissolve, as to loose cords which tie, or Camels which are tyed with them, is by the Talmudists taken for *absolving, remitting, forgiving, pardoning*; so saith Elias Levita in *Thibby*, it is used by the Rabbins for pardoning and remitting, as, *סָלַח ה' לְחַטְאֵי הִלֵּל* The merciful God pardon Hillel! and in the prayer that begins, *כָּל יִרְרֵי* All shall be remitted, or pardon'd. So in a place cited by Coch out of *Gem. Moed. Caton. c. 3.* *Quid remedium age cum ipso לך ירשור* ut remittat tibi, that he may loose you from the excommunication: and again, *adi principem לך ירשור* that he may remit it to you. So c. 1. *Nedarim*, *Steti coram R. Huna, cum audiens quendam nomen Dei in vanum proferre, eam excommunicaret, & statim eâ presente anathema relaxaret*; there the word *שָׁלַח* is used again, for loosing in our sense, relaxing of, or freeing from a censure of excommunication, directly all one with *מִטִּד לוֹ* remittatur ipsi, following in the same place, which even now we produced.

A third word there is ordinarily used to this purpose, of the same importance, and that is *פָּדַת*. So in *Moed Katon, Sapiens potest seipsum excommunicare, a wiseman may excommunicate himself וְיִפְדֶּה לְעַצְמוֹ* and free or loose himself again: and so in that out of *1. Nedarim*, in *J. Coch*, *excommunicationem posse & vestigio rescindi*, there the word is *לְהַפְדֵּה* in both, contrary to excommunication.

By the little that hath been said, it may sufficiently appear, that to bind and to loose may be found even among the Talmudists to signifie somewhat beside interpreting or declaring, *quid vetitum, quid permissum sacra lege, what is forbidden, what permitted by the law of God*, as that referres simply *ad solam docendi, & interpretandi, vel Theologiæ præceptive munus, onely to the office of teaching, and interpreting, and of preceptive Divinity, &c.* and that 'tis no way contrary to the stile or idiom of those writers to affirm, that binding and loosing belongs to Censures, (and not only to stating of Cases of Conscience) even if the Talmud were

our judge : for sure there is nothing more ordinary in that, then to heare of *loosing* them who are *excommunicate*; which must needs imply, that they which were so *excommunicate*, till they were *loosed*, were supposed *bound* also.

Sect. 16.

And therefore it may be observed (in passing) that the learned H. Grotius having in his Notes on Matth. 16. 19. made this Talmudical observation, that *לֵבַי* *Nay* to bind, & *לֵבַי* or *לֵבַי* *Nay* to loose, are by the Hebrewes attributed to the interpreters of the law, (which seems something agreeable to this observation) conceiving the Keyes there spoken of, to be the keyes of knowledge, Luk. 11. 52. doth yet on Matth. 16. 19. interpret *Nay* and *Nay* binding and loosing there, by *negativ* and *affirmatiu* retaining and remitting, Joh. 20. 23. and in his notes on that third place acknowledges, that thus the Apostles did *remit*, either when by Baptisme they received into the Church those that professed the faith, or when after the testimony of serious repentance they received into their communion those that had been *lapsed* or *fallen*, and applies to it that of the 2 Cor. 2. 10. *To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also*, (which belongs clearly to the *excommunicate*, *incestuous* person, in the former Epistle, who was it seems by this Ecclesiastical course brought to a capacity of remission, and absolution by that time, and now absolved by St. Paul) and for the conjunction of both these senses in the interpretation of that place, he produces S. Cyprians authority, Ep. 73. To which I shall only adde, that in another part of his Notes upon the Gospels, Luk. 6. 22. this very Judicious man (whose education might have given him as great prejudices against the Prelacie, as any other) hath given us a very excellent tract concerning this subject of Excommunication, or Censures; And at last resolves out of St. Cyprians Epistles, *Totum ferme Christiane discipline vigorem in istis iudiciis constitisse*, &c. that well nigh all the vigor of Christian discipline consisted in those judgments of the Church. *Quem morem qui ex Ecclesiâ sublatum volunt, gravissimum infligunt vulnus discipline, quam corruptis adeo Christianorum moribus ad veterem severitatem reduci maximum sit operæ pretium, tantum abest, ut ulla ejus pars reliqua laxari debeat*, &c. Which custome they which would remove out of the church, inflict a most grievous wound on discipline, which (now in  
this

this notable corruption of the manners of Christians) it were most excellently worth any mans pains to have reduced to its antient severity, so far is it from being fit, that any remaining member or part of it should be loosed, or put out of joynt; and in another place, *Disciplinam morum ego non refugio, ut modò pax coeat, nulla futura sit tam severa, cui non libenter me meosque sim subiecturus.* For the discipline in order to manners, I would willingly subject my self, and all that belong to me, to the severest that could be brought into the Church. But this by the way.

Sect. 17.

For the perfecting of this answer, and satisfying all the contrary appearances fully, it must yet farther be observed, that there is one thing presumed, and not undertaken to be proved in this objection, without which all the observations from the Talmud are utterly invalid and unconcluding, and that one thing not at all to be granted by us, being indeed, as I conceive, very far from truth. It is this; that by the particule *;* and *וְכֵן* [whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.] is noted the thing, and not the person, for so that interpretation requires [what thing soever ye shall declare to be unlawful, &c.] whereas it's no new thing in all languages and dialects to put the neuter for the masculine gender, things for persons, and that in the New Testament; is not without example; as *Joh. 17. 7.* 'tis our Saviours dialect (and it is the very word *ἄνθρωποι*, which we have now in hand) *ἄνθρωποι* *πάντες*, &c. whatsoever, i.e. all those men, v. 6. and so *1 Joh. 5. 4.* *πάντες οἱ γεννηθέντες* expounded by *πάντες*, &c. v. 18. every thing, i.e. every one, that is born of God. Thus when S. John, *Apost. 21. 27.* speaketh of man, and other the like inhabitants of the new Jerusalem, he saith, there shall not enter in there any thing that defileth, or that worketh abomination, or a lye; *οὐδὲν κοινόν* in the neuter, which is, no doubt, no unclean abominable person, &c. So *2 Thess. 2. 4.* the Apostle speaking of Antichrist, saith, that he exalteth himself above all that is called God; where the [*πάντες* all] in the neuter, sure signifies in the masculine, every person that partakes of that name, the King and Potentates of the Earth; so *Heb. 7. 7.* *ὁ μικρότερος* in the neuter, for the lesser or inferior person, v. 15. *ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος* for no man; and *Ch. 12. 13.* *ὁ γὰρ* for him that is lame: With which Examples the phrase in this text beares such proportion, that it cannot be unjust to resolve, that it is at least possible, that the neuters here may in

in sense be masculine also ; which very possibility were enough to evacuate the *Talmudical* observation, the accommodation of which to this place supposes the neutral sense of the *ἰ* and *ἡ* to be certainly there meant, and is not reconcilable with the Masculine. For to say [*Whomsoever you shall declare to be unlawful or prohibited, &c.* were not sense ; whereas on the other side, the granting the neutral sense, would not so necessarily destroy our pretensions, this rendring of the words being proper enough, and home to our turn, [*whatsoever yee shall bind on earth, i.e. whatever sins of any trespasser ye shall conclude under the Censures*] or again, *whatsoever punishment you shall bind on mens shoulders* (the speech being still limited to this one sort of punishments) it shall be bound or ratified in heaven : though the truth is, the personal notion of the *ἡ*, being so agreeable to other phrases of the Scripture, I have no temptation to doubt but that it is the importance of the place [*whatsoever, i.e. whomsoever you shall bind on earth, by the power of the Keyes, shut out of this lower kingdom of heaven, conclude under the Ecclesiastical bands, or censures, &c. shall be bound in heaven, &c.*] i.e. by God ratified there, (supposing that what they do, they do according to the rule,) this is most commodious & agreeable to the mention of the Keyes (to which 'tis annexed, *Matth. 16.*) which certainly denote power of receiving, or excluding not some thing, but some person, & to the trespassing brother supposed to become refractory (to which 'tis annexed, *Matth. 18.*) who is still a person also ; to which I will onely add that in the beginning of that discourse, *Matth. 18. 11.* there is another manifest example of a neuter word in a masculine sense, *The Sonne of man came to save, το σῶμα, that which was lost, i.e. those little ones, v. 10. of whom God would not that one should perish, v. 14.*

Sect. 18.

To this account of that first argument (sufficient I conceive to prove that this interpretation hanging thus loose from the *Talmudical* use of the word, is not in the rendring this text of the New Testament, necessary to be received) I shal yet farther add these two observations more, 1. That the *Talmudical* sense cannot have place in the latter part of Christs speech [*ὅσα δεσμεύσῃ ἐν τῷ ἡμένῳ, ἔσονται δεσμευμένα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, shall be bound in heaven*] and therefore will be improbable in the former. For sure the *binding in heaven* is some-  
what

what more then Gods interpretation or declaration of the lawfulness of any thing; and if the Church should be thought unfit to have any kind of power, yet heaven is acknowledged capable of it; besides, the form and composure of the words will enforce, that if that pretended Talmudical sense were admitted in both places, Gods declaring any thing to be *lawful*, or *unlawful*, must be consequent to the Ministers declaration here, which will be very unreasonable; for though Gods Censures may by vertue of his promise follow the Censures of the Church, yet Gods Laws (for such are his declarations of what is *law*) sure cannot; or if they do, this will be a great assurance that there is some power in the Church, when it is so backt by God.

A second argument to this purpose may be taken from the Analogy of Scripture, or comparing the two places in *Matth.* of binding and loosing, with that third in *John* of remitting and retaining; which I conceive is proved to belong to the same matter, whatsoever that should prove to be, but then will not be so capable of the Talmudical interpretation, for sure that will not be so clear from those writers also, that *destruy* to retain, hath that sense among the Talmudists, which was imposed upon *Shas*, to bind, which for the present I shall take for granted, till some proof be offer'd to the contrary, and in that found the power of the Church, (supposing it were not deductible from S. Matthew) and then by analogie of those places in S. Matthew, with this in S. John, apply it to those places also.

Now for the second proof which is offer'd by the same hand against the received interpretation, the places in Greek authors where the word *Shas* or binding is vouched to signifie forbidding onely, though I might justly say, that forbidding is much more then declaring, or interpreting a thing to be forbidden, that an act of power, and not onely of doctrine, of a Magistrate, and not onely of a Casuist; and secondly, that we are not wont to require the dictions of the New Testament, which have so much of the Old Testament Hebrew idiom in them, to be tryed by Attical heathen Greek writers, yet shall I not now need to refuse that trial which is here offer'd. Two onely places there are produced (or in the margin appointed to be consulted with) to  
that

Sect. 19.

Sect. 20.

purpose, *Eustathius* and *Didymus* in *Hom. II. σ. ἐμπίδες δῖον Ἀχίλλεος ἀλλήγε γένει*, and *Inscription. Iſidis ap. Diod. Sic. l. 1.* These two places I have with all attention considered, and shall truly report what I have found in them.

Sect. 21.

*Eustathius* brings several interpretations of these words in *Hom.* the first of which is, that δῖον may signify καλῶσαι, ἐμπίδες δῖον ὁ Ἀχίλλεος, i. e. ἔδωκεν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ τὸ ἀλλήγε γένει, ἢ γὰρ ἐμπίδες τὸ Πατρόκλου; which that you may understand, you must know the occasion of *Homer's* speech, it was this; *Patroclus* was slain, and *Achilles* knew not how to help him, or avenge his death, for which he hath very passionate sorrow, even to wish he were dead himself, because he could not avenge that death of his, this he thus expresses in *Homer's* language:

Ἀντίκα τεθνήσκην, ἐπεὶ ἐν ἄρ' ἔμελλον ἑταῖρόν  
ἔκτρον ἰδὼν, ἐπαμύναναι, ὃ μὲν μάλ' ἀπὸ Τήλοιο πάσης  
ἔφθιτο, ἐμπίδες δῖον Ἀχίλλεος ἀλλήγε γένει.

I would, or, O that I might presently dye, in that I was not able to avenge the death of my Companion! He dyed far from his countrey, and Mars, or the Fate of war both bound, or hindered, or restrained me from being avenger of his blood: where it must be observed, that Mars did not give any precept or interdiction to *Achilles* not to avenge *Patroclus*, or declare that it was unlawful, but only that the fate of the war had not so far favour'd him, as that he could find any means to do it, which he calls *binding* or *hindring* him; and therefore *Didymus*, to whom we are referred, renders it ἐν ἐπιδιδόν, *hindered*, and explains the whole matter by this paraphrase: ὁ πολέμους ἐμὴν ἀφαιδιδόντος παρόπλιον, ἔδωκεν ἐμῷ ἔκτρον, ὥστε ἀλλήγε μὴ γένειναι πατρόκλου. τ. ε. βοηθῶν. The fight having deprived me of my Arms, would not suffer me to go out and help *Patroclus*; and so it seems the forbidding, by which they render δῖον, is only that of *hindring* or *stopping*; (which is a natural effect of the vulgar notion of the word, as it signifies *binding*, he that is bound being hindered or stopt from his course or action,) not of *prohibiting* or *interdicting*. But then moreover you must consider, that the same *Eustathius* and *Didymus* observe in that last verse many different lections, as for example, one especially, in stead

of





what *lawes*, but) what *punishments* she would, and then, that no body had power to undo whatſoever ſhe thus did, to reſcind, or looſe, or abſolve what ſhe ſo bound? In as wide a ſenſe as this, I could produce many places in Greek Authors, particularly a paſſage of Proclus out of Plato in his ſixth Diſcourſe about the Eternity of the world, where to prove the world cannot be diſſolv'd by the Creator of it, and yet by none but the Creator, he expreſſes it often in theſe two words, δεσναι & λυσαι [δεναι & λυσαι] meaning by *binding*, the compoſing the whole compages of the world, and by *loofing* the deſtroying, or, as we ſay, the diſſolution of it : this, I confeſſe, is nothing to our ſenſe of the words, (and as little to that other) and yet very near as much as the place now cited. Being left to gueſſe what was the occaſion of producing this place to that other purpoſe, I ſhall think it poſſible that it was occaſion'd by this, that in the margin *Stephanus* hath ſet *ενομοθετσα*, in ſtead of *εναθισα*, which if it were conceived to be a *Scholion*, might be taken to be a teſtimony, that *binding* ſignifies making of lawes, as far as that *Scholiſts* authority would reach. For the preſent, I ſhall ſuppoſe that this is it, becauſe I cannot think of any other way to help this *medium* to inferre the deſired *concluſion* in any degree, and yet make no queſtion but there was ſome : But then, if that be it, I muſt interpoſe, 1. That that in the margin is not a *Scholion*, but an *emendation*, or *various lection*, as the mark prefixed ſignifies; and then ſeeing 'tis aſſured, that *Diod. Sic.* or the inſcription it ſelf which he ſets down, had not both theſe readings, it will thence follow, that either it was truly *ενομοθετσα*, (and then there is no authority from thence for any ſignification of *θισα*) or elſe that it was *θισα*, and then there is no appearance of proof, that *θισα* ſignifies there *νομοθετσα*; and this is ſufficient to the matter in hand, which part ſoever of the *dilemma* be accepted.

Secl. 23.

But having ſaid this, I ſhall ſuperadde *ex abundanti* my opinion of the importance of that inſcription, viz. that *Iſis* the Queen of that region, was taught or inſtructed by Mercury in the *ἐμπνευμένη φιλοσοφία*, bidden philoſophy. *ἐμπνευμένη* & *διαφωτισμένη*, dark representations of truth, *αὐτοματὴς* *σοφία*, the enigmatical wiſdome which their theologie was full of; mention'd by Plut

<sup>k</sup> Plut. de Is. & Osir. and that nobody was able to reveale, or en-<sup>k</sup> Edit. Paris.  
pound her riddles or mysteries. The ground of this my interpreta-  
tion is, an inscription of Isis's temple mention'd by Plutarch, im-  
mediately upon his discourse of that enigmatically theology in  
the place foremention'd. Τὸ δ' ἐν Σαῖς ἱερὸν (ὅτι καὶ ἰσὺν νομίζου-  
σιν) ἑστῶτος ἐστὶ τοιοῦτον. ἐν ᾧ εἰμὶ πάν τὸ γινώσκον, καὶ δὲ ἐν  
σβένον, καὶ ἂ ἐμὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδού τοῦ δυνάστε ἀπαυλῶσαν. The temple of  
Minerva (which they take for Isis) in Saos had such an inscription (not  
literally this, but such an one, or to this purpose) I am every  
thing that hath been, and that is, and that shall be, and my vaile (or what  
I shall think fit to conceale) no mortall hath ever been able to discover.  
This seems to be a paraphrase of that other inscription in Dio-  
dorus, and then though the words differ (which the τοιοῦτον  
[not the very same, but such an one] intimates) yet the sense of  
the one seems to be fully express'd by the other, & then the con-  
clusion will be this, that as ἰσὺν in Diodorus, signifying no more  
then ἀναλυσάτω to reveale in Plutarch (as to loose a riddle, a se-  
cret, is to reveal it, to which the Key of Knowledge in the Scrip-  
ture may also referre,) belongs not at all to the matter in  
hand, or declaring a thing to be lawfull, so the contrary ἰσὺν is  
not applyable to that purpose of forbidding, or declaring a thing  
to be forbidden, and so much for that testimony also.

• To all this which hath been said the Reader may farther add, Sect. 24. :  
that Suidas, Hesychius, and Phavorinus have no other notion of  
δένου, then that of binding in hands, and therefore render it by  
δεσμεύω, and δεσμός. Only in Hesychius in one place I find these  
words, δεσμεύω, νόμου, δεσμός: which words stand in need of  
some emendation (as a very great part of that book doth) & may  
be thus set right. δεσμεύω νόμου, δεσμός, A man bound by law, i.e.  
a prisoner; or δεσμεύω, νόμου δεσμός, bound, i.e. a prisoner of the law,  
or else this seems to be the designe of them, that the word  
δεσμεύω is used in a sense proportionable to that wherein νόμος,  
law, is δεσμός a band, as indeed every law is a band to all those  
that are under it: but then you may observe, that this is a very  
distant sense of the word from that which was cited from the  
Talmudists, (where the thing bound is said to be forbidden,) for  
here δεσμεύω signifies bound, or commanded, and so this (beside  
that it gives the Church a power from Christ of commanding and

making ~~any~~, to which in any probability the power of ~~any~~ would be consequent) is little to our present disquisition.

Sec. 25.

I cannot satisfy my self, that I have vindicated my position sufficiently, unless unto the consideration of the former objections, I add also some few words in taking notice of what the Socinians have resolved to this matter; which I shall transcribe out of Volkellus, de ver. cel. l. 6. c. 4. Where having express the power of binding and loosing, to be the power, *Alios quidem reatu peccatorum quodammodo constringendi, alios vero ab illo absolvendi*; of binding some in some manner under the guilt of sins, but of absolving others, he resolves this to consist in this onely, *ut praeambulatorie manerit, quod tanquam Christi ligatus sustinebat, alius quidem nempe omnibus in Christum credentibus, atque ex animo ei obtemperantibus, remissionem peccatorum, ipsum nomine offerret, alius vero parum sempiternas denunciatet.* That by authority of that office which he sustains as an Ambassador of Christ, he should offer in his Name remission of sins to some, to wit, to all that believe in Christ, and cordially obey him, but denounce unto others eternall punishments. So that in effect the power of binding and loosing should be onely the power of offering remission of sins to penitents, that is, preaching the Gospel, and no more.

Sec. 26.

This magisterial affirmation having no tender or offer of proof annex to it, will need no long stay to consider it; what ever is in it of poison, or danger, will easily be dispell'd by an antidote, which the very same shop in another box will yield us, and that is another very distant interpretation of that power of binding and loosing, c. 15. of that book (how faine from the same pen of him that had before said *in eo tantum fuisse constitutam, ut remissionem offerret, &c.* that it consisted onely in the offering of remission, &c. or, by what means reconcilable with that sense, I will not go about to conjecture) where affirming the power of exterminating impious Christians, to be intrusted to the Church, he proves it, 1. from the words of St. Paul about the excommunicating the incestuous Corinthian; then from this, that Christ speaking of the contumacious trespasser refusing to obey the Church, and thereupon commanding him to be accounted as a heathen, and a publican, *in caelo ratum esse dicit, quicquid Ecclesia in terris ligat,*

and solvin, affirm that to be ratified in heaven, whatsoever it is the Church on earth binds or looses, i. e. quicquid vel a fidelium commercio segregat, vel in eorum numerum recipit, whatsoever the Church separates from the commerce of the faithfull, or restores to the number of them: where I conceive it apparent, (unlesse some very close sophisme ly hid under plain words) that binding signifies discommuniting, excommunicating, segregating from the commerce of the faithfull, which I willingly embrace, as the concession of that man, and the sense of his fellows, very fit to be confronted to his former negation, especially being backt, as it is with a conjecture of his (which I have long thought to be most probable) that St. Paul forbidding Timothy, to lay bands suddenly on any man, Tim. 5. 22. lest he partake of other mens sins, refers to the reception of penitents that had been formerly excommunicate. For such, he truly saith, were wont to be received into the Church again by imposition of bands.

Evidences of that custome he brings from the narrations of Sect. 27. Visitor, about the Vandalick persecution, l. 2. *Qui nobis penitentiam manus collaturi sunt, & reconciliationis indulgentiam, abstrictis peccato peccatorum vinculis solvuri: Ipsa confer on us the bands of penitence, and favour of reconciliation, loosing from the bands of sinnes, those which are bound by sin.* Where the penitentia manus, the bands of penitence, and loosing from bands of sin, belong to those which were bound, but now are reconciled: and the like from the 5<sup>th</sup> Canon of the Councell of Carthage, dist. 50. *Presbyteris ac Diaconis, si quando de gravi aliqua culpa convicti a ministerio remoti fuissent manus non imponerentur, ut penitentibus, vel aliis ex fidelium laicis,* That Presbyters and Deacons, when upon conviction of any grievous fault they are removed from the Ministry, should not have imposition of bands, as penitents, &c. and out of Fulgentius, Ep. 1. de conjug. *Illâ egrotâ acceptâ manus impositione penitentiam secundum morem, quem habet Christiana religio, peregit;* she performed her penance by receiving imposition of bands according to the manner observed in the Christian Religion. To these you may add that of Alcinus Ep. 24. *Manus impositionem adhibete converso ab heresi;* They that were recover'd from heresie, were to have imposition of bands, a signe of absolution. *Interdictâ nominis ejus in posterum, si ex corde convertitur, mentione;* and his name no longer to be mention'd in the bed-  
role.



p. 148.

role of the hereticks. And the Author contra Predestin. l. 3. *Non aut sunt Ecclesiarum Pontifices manum imponere penitentibus, nisi confessionem voluntariam ostendentibus.* The Bishops durst not impose hands on the penitent, unless he express a voluntary confession; and many the like. And in the Chron. of Jo. Gerundens. speaking of the Arrians Synod of Toledo, congregated by Leovigildus, one of the Canons is, *De Romanâ religione ad nostram Catholicam fidem venientes non debere baptizari, sed tantummodo per manus impositionem & communionis perceptionem abluï.* They which came over to them from that which they counted heresie, should only have imposition of hands, &c. and not baptism anew, and many other passages there are of that kind. This is a very probable interpretation, as antient as S. Cyprian, and may, by the way, farther be attested not only by the analogy between absolution, and healing diseases, of which Imposition was the ceremony, but also by the context it self, where v. 19. is set down the proceeding, by way of Censure, against a Presbyter, and the publike checking of sinners, v. 20. a charge to do all *quæ sunt per quælibet*, v. 21. without prejudging, and *quod non est per quælibet*, nothing by favour or inclination; and then immediately follows, lay hands on no man suddenly; Absolution very properly annexed to Censures, (and I conceive a caution, that by knowing mens sinnes, he be not brought to partake with them, but that he keep himself unpolluted, in the remainder of that verse, upon which the 23. verse may follow pertinently, though as in a parenthesis, that Timothy may drink a little wine for his health, and not incur the danger of partaking of other mens sinnes) and then v. 24. a rule of direction for that whole matter, that as some mens sins are conspicuous before-hand, and so bring them per modum meriti precedentis, by way of precedent merit, to censure; and in some other men the sins follow after censure also, as when there is no reformation upon censures, (in which case there must be no absolution) so in like manner also mens good works (in case they do reform upon censure) are, or must be manifest before absolution, (and therefore the ancient Canons require the *agathosynas* good works or almes-deeds in the penitent to prepare for absolution) and those that are not so, (i.e. their not bringing forth such worthy fruits of repentance) cannot be concealed, and so by that means Timothy may discern who are fit to be absolved, who not, and so all the context

context clearly belongs to this matter. But this by the way.

Onely having so pregnant an opportunity, I shall add what Sect. 28. I conceive concerning the imposition of hands, Heb. 6. 2. joined there with the doctrine of Baptismes. The Apostle there had mention'd *ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the discourse of the beginning of Christ, i.e. the first things that we read of in the Gospel; and he refers them, as I conceive, to four heads, 1. Repentance, or change from dead works; 2. Faith on God: These two he calls the Doctrine of Baptismes, & of the Imposition of hands, either by way of *ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (of which I gave you examples in the sacred stile) and then Cap. 1. sec. 10. the Doctrine of Baptismes will be appropriated to Faith on God, unto which men are baptized, and the doctrine of Imposition of hands to repentance, which is the preparatory to absolution; or else both of these together, Faith and Repentance, must be affirmed to be the doctrine both of Baptismes in the plural, and of Imposition of hands too, and that both as it denotes confirmation, Act. 15. 41. parallel to Christs blessing (of those which had been baptized before) with laying his hands on them, and absolution too, parallel to his laying hands on the sick. Luke 4. when he healed them, which is called loosing *ἀποδεῦν* from a band, Luk. 13. 16. and all this will be proper: for both the Baptisme of John, and of Christ, required of them that came to it, Repentance and Faith; and Confirmation being but a kind of sealing, and repetition of the Covenant, and the promises made in baptism, (without water, onely by laying on of hands) was so too; and Absolution, though it peculiarly required Repentance, yet it included also Faith on God, and peculiarly that branch of it, the believing remission of sins upon repentance. Besides these, there follow two doctrines more, the Resurrection, and Eternal judgment, which may be also reduced to these two heads, The Resurrection to that of Faith in Baptisme, of which it was a peculiar part, (the *trina immersio*, the three dippings, so antient in the Church, referring distinctly to his rising the third day, and so perhaps the *βαπτισμὸς τῶν νεκρῶν*, 1 Cor. 15. i.e. in S. Chrysostomes opinion, being baptized into the Faith, or belief of that Article, intimated, or briefly express'd by *ῥυτὰς τοὺς νεκροὺς* the Dead) and Everlasting judgment to that of Repentance from dead works, which if not repented from,

from, i. e. *for saken*, would bring that judgement upon men. But this by the way, and as a conjecture incident, and agreeable to the former.

## Sect. 29.

I have thus far proceeded in this matter for the removing of prejudices, & vindicating our position from two sorts of objecters, & might now think it reasonable to proceed to a third view, viz. of *Erasmus's* structure, and all that he hath said of this matter; but this would require so intolerable a length, that if I should apply my self to it, I should both chafe the most patient Reader, and leave the rest which I have to say on the other points at first proposed, to be overwhelmed or lost under the shade of so vast a *redigyon*. Some prudence therefore there will be need of for the *compounding* of this business, that I may neither too much *despise*, nor too largely *prosecute* this objecter: And the most convenient middle betwixt these two extremities, I suppose, will be, 1. To bring you acquainted with the Person, 2. To give you an account how he fell out, or on what occasion his quarrell to *Excommunication* began. 3. To view the place, and the weapons, at which we are likely to meet, i. e. to follow him *ad redd*: so far, till we see directly what the state of the question is, wherein the point of the difference between us consists; and then to put off the combat, till the spectators are ready to call for it, and shall profess themselves armed with patience to sit it out.

## Sect. 30.

For the first of these, the view of the person, I shall say no more, then that he was a Dr. of *Physick* in *Geneva*, who having fallen on an age when *novelties* were in fashion, (the *Bishop* turn'd out, and a Government brought in, which within few years before was acknowledg'd so new, that *Calvin* was fain to write to the *Protestants* in *Helvetia*, that they would but signify their approbation of it, and could not obtain that neither, though soon after, it undertook to be the only *divine Modell* in the world since *Christs* time) thought it not unreasonable to step out of his profession, and offer to the world his *novelty* too, and having in his own profession exprest in some particulars, a *zeale*, which others of his faculty will affirm to have been without knowledge, (as when he speaks of the preparation of *Stri-*

him, or *credo metallorum*, and the *Antimarian* recits, he resolves that no man can *salva conscientia*, with a safe Conscience administer them, which yet every *Physitian* knows now by daily experience to be very useful and safe) it will not be matter of wonder, if he committed the like mistake in the business of *Excommunication* (a medicine more out of the proper roade of his studies) and conceived that poysonous noxious recipe in the Church, (judging, it seems, at a first view, that they which were most wicked needed rather to be invited to the Church, then driven from it) which the experience of all Christian Churches, and the advice of *Christ* himselfe, as a *Physitian* of *Soules*, have concluded to be very *harmlesse* and *medicinal*. I shall say no more of his person, but that he doth not seem by his book to have considered much of *Divinity*, save only of this one head, and in order to that present controversie. And then though I should not make an objection against an Author, that his book and he were of divers *Professions*; and faculties, because he that is not a *Divine* by profession, may yet, if he have no calling, have spent his whole time on *Divinity*, and if he have undertaken another profession, may yet neglect that, that he may spend his time in this nobler faculty, or may have those excellent abilities, that he may attain to as great an height in two faculties, as others of meaner parts may do in one, yet, if it appear by any sure *vestiges*, that that *Physitian* which writes in *Divinity*, hath studied little more *Divinity* then at that time a few moneths could help him to, and thinks this provision sufficient to furnish him, to write contrary to the whole judgement of the Church before him, I may as safely commend a *Divine*, that when he is sick first of a *disease*, then, through impatience of his *Physitian*, shall by looking over some *Physick-books* take confidence to control his *Physitian*, and that he may do so the more authoritatively, cast off all the antient *Masters* of that faculty before him, or affirm that in them he finds nothing contrary to his opinion, when they that have read them all, know there is nothing more contrary. This I have said, because this *Doctor* makes his complaint of the *opposition*, and *contempt*, and *affronts* put upon him by those friends, to whom before the setting out he had communicated his book, objecting, saith he, no-

thing against him, but that he was besides his calling; which therefore with him, I confesse, to be an insufficient argument against his book, if it have no other to joyn with it; and I rather conceive, that it was a civility in his friends which used it, then an entire and sole objection, designed by them as a means to take him off from a confidence that he had done well (by telling him, he was no competent judge whether he had or no, and advising him, that being a stranger in that faculty, he should not depend too much upon his own judgement) rather than an acknowledgement, that they had nothing else to object to him. And if civilities be apt to be thus mistaken, the truth is, a little plain dealing were a more friendly office. I shall therefore have no necessity of replying to his answers to those friends: That [*Scrutamini Scripturas*] and [*Probate spiritualia*] [*Search the Scriptures*] and [*Try the things that are spiritual*] were a sufficient commission to him for that attempt, especially if 'twere true which he addes, <sup>m</sup> *that if he had had a stipend to read Divinity, this fact of his would then have nothing in it, in their opinion* alienē from his office or duty. Where yet, I suppose, the office might be distinguisht from the stipend; and though the money be not apt to inspire, as a *χάρις* or grace, yet sure the *μίσθω*, or calling to the office may go for a *χάρισμα*, to which we may hope for the annexion of Gods blessing, more then to the *ἀδωροδοτικόν*, (the meddling in faculties, or studies that belong not to us,) we have any promise to authorize us to expect.

*m Si stipendia  
conductus theo-  
logica docerem,  
nihil sec. ipsos  
ab officio, &  
munere in hac  
parte alieni  
facerem. Pref.*

Señ. 31.

2. For the occasion of his quarrel against Excommunication, I shall give you no other account, then what from himself I have received (who, I suppose, was able to speak the bottom of the truth, and nothing else) and while I do so, shall desire the Reader to observe, how certain it is, that the *fabrick* of the Church of England, I mean the ancient structure, as it stands by Law, and the doctrines thereof, would never have provoked him to this enmity, if he had lived here under the best, or perhaps worst daies of our Episcopacy; and then as his *Hippocrates* in his excellent tract *μετ' ἡμῶν, ἀπ' αὐτῶν, & τῶν ἄλλων*, will tell us of a mighty influence, that the place, the air, or some such accidentall circumstance may have upon the bodies first, and through them, the minds of men, so will the Reader find, that his having changed  
the



the air, had been excellent effectuall Physick for him, and in all probability, might have made a shift to have changed his opinions also.

The first thing, which, saith he, cast him on those considerations against Excommunication, was the unreasonableness of the time for the administering of such purging Physick. There was then saith he, a great paucity of Protestant Professors, and the number of Papists extremely overtopt them in those parts; and of the Protestants scarce the thirtieth part understood, and approved the doctrine, and therefore it must be, in his opinion, a strange improper season for the setting up this course of severe rugged discipline, which would exclude from the Sacrament so many of the few Protestants, that it would both unpeople their assemblies, and necessarily cause a dangerous scissure in the multitude.

Señ. 32.

The second thing was his having observ'd the unwisdom of the persons, that were employ'd and presid'd in this matter (their Ministers and Lay-Elders) fit, saith he, neither for age, nor experience, nor wit, nor judgement, nor manners, nor authority, to be esteem'd able to sustain so great an office with dignity.

Señ. 33.

The third thing (and that which advanced him in his conceit that he had falln upon the right sense of the Scriptures produced and pleaded for this discipline) was, the consideration of the state of the Commonwealth and Church among the Jews, God having said, Deut. 4. that that people had Laws and Statutes so just and wise, that the institutions of no Nations, the sanctions of no Commonwealths, no Ordinances, though never so wisely thought on, could compare with them, and therefore that that Church must needs be best, and most wisely disposed, which came nearest to the Jewish form. A consideration indeed, that it seems, was of great weight with him, nor observing that that comparisson in Deut. was made only betwixt the Jewish, and other heathen nations of the world at that time, and only in relation to their present state, and not to the prejudice of Christs institutions after, when that nation and religion was destroyed; and that if that argument were of weight, (besides that he must be bound to prove his Modell out of the Mosaiack Law) he must be oblig'd also to bring back all the Sacrifices, Passover, Circumcision, Ceremonies of the Jews into the Christian Church, and turn both the Lords Day, the Sacra-

Señ. 34.

ments, and the very Religion of Christ the *υιου του Θεου*, the Law of Faith, out of it.

The fourth thing, saith he, and that which set him on writing was, an accident that he then observed, *An English man which at that time had quitted this Kingdome on the dislike of Ceremonies, and came to Geneva, and proposed his Thesis there de adiaphoris & vestibus, of things indifferent, and of vestments, particularly, the Surplice, &c. he was, saith he, not permitted to maintain them publicly, ne Anglos offenderent, that they might not offend the English. This man therefore, changing his purpose, chose a new Thesis, In quavis re clē institutā Ecclesiā hanc servari procuratorem, in quā ministri cum suo delecto ad eam rem Presbyterio juxta teneant quosvis persequentes etiam Principes excommunicandi: That in every well order'd Church this government was to be observed, in which the Ministers with their Elderships chosen to that purpose should have power of Excommunicating all offenders, even Princes themselves: and this Thesis, saith he, he was permitted to maintain. I hope, he did not beleeve, that the English would be better pleased, or lesse offended with it, then with that other about Surplices, but only that 'twas a doctrine, wherein that Common-wealth of Geneva was more concern'd, and so did not so much consider how the English might take it from them, as in the other, where they were lesse interess'd, they had leasure to do. That the doctrine of the Anglican Church, and constant practise of it, is utterly abhorrent from this dangerous sacrilegious excessse, I shall not be so wary or humble, as to think it necessary to demonstrate, but confess that he which saw that doctrine so confidently, and so early avow'd by the Disciplinaryans, had a great temptation to write against their Excommunication, though no ground of assurance, that all which he should say against that subject, would therefore prove true, because that one doctrine of those which asserted it was so far from being such. Mr Hooker hath given a very good judgement of his enterprize; that Beza and he divided the truth betwixt them, neither of them saying all truth, nor all falsehood, each of them *παρεισχευοντες* *ιδιαις μυστηριας, πολλὰ δε λυγρον*, disguising, and allaying, and drowning a little of wholesome doctrine, with a great deal of the contrary. And let me say, to conclude this point, that both in the taking up his opinion, and in maintain-*

ing

ing it, *Erastus* hath more to impute to *Beza's* and the *Genevan's* errors, and innovations, and excesses and extravagances (which upon inquiry into the antient Church records, he truly saith, he could not find avowed, or authorized) then to his own grounds, or arguments against *Excommunication*.

The last motive, which, he confesses, perfected the work, and put him upon the *Presse*, was the contempt and affronts of his friends, i.e. in effect, the opinions and good advices of all men that saw his *Theses*, and could by no means like them: but this hath been occasionally mentioned already, and only gives the Reader occasion to admire, and bewail the infelicity of passionate men, who cannot receive any benefit by their friends, are in the unluckiest condition of all men living, (beyond which no enemy can wish them a greater curse) sure to be the worse for that, which God meant us for the most inestimable blessing. I mean the *ἀλλοτρίωσις*, *ὑποψίασις*, their telling us truth, and (out of desire of doing us good) admonishing us of our miscarriages, which he that cannot make any other use of, then to interpret those huge obligations for affronts, those friendships for rudenesses, and therefore resolves to publish his conceits, because all his friends to whom he communicates them, advise him by all means to suppress them, may well be allowed to write a volume against all kind of *Excommunication*, being already, it appears, so far from being able to bear such strong *Physick*, that the most private prudent, first, or second admonition of single persons, or *ἐκκλησιαστικῆς*, the joynt act of a College of friends and *Physicians* do but make him more incurable.

Sect. 35.

I come now to my third undertaking, i.e. to view his *Theses* of *Excommunication*, and follow him step by step, till we have sprang the point of the difficulty between us; and, I think, that part of the progress will sufficiently discover the weakness of his fabrick; at least how little appearance of advantage he hath against us, that are not for the *Geneva-Presbytery*, how well soever *ad homines* he may be thought to have disputed.

Sect. 36.

His first *Thesis* layes the ground of his discourse, and of his mistake. The word [*Excommunication*] he will have taken from *nomen videtur ex 1 Cor. 10. desumptum esse, atque amotionem significare à communione illa, quæ ibidem corpus Christi nominatur.*

Sect. 37.

Th. 1. *Excommunicationis*

1 Cor. 10. which is false, and not endeavored to be proved, and upon the back of that error, another falsity, viz. that *Communion* is there call'd *Corpus Christi*, *The body of Christ*; all that is there said toward that matter, is, that the wine is, *non via aqua* 10. *The Communication* (not *Communion*) of the blood of Christ, the bestowing his blood upon us, a means or a pledge of making us partakers of that rich mercy, that blood that was shed for us. That that is the right rendring of *non via*, is undertaken in another discourse upon the *Sacrament*; and needs no further to be repeated here, the notion of the word *Excommunication* being most clear and uncontroversed, that it is the sequestering of an offender from the *Communion*, i.e. the visible Society of Christians, without ever thinking to cut him off, but on the contrary desiring to engraft him the more firmly into the *invisible*, and then also again into the Church, the visible (but mystical) body of Christ. And therefore,

• Sanè nunc  
excommunica-  
tio ab omnibus  
definitur exclu-  
sione è societate  
& communio-  
ne fidelium. 1b.

Sett. 38.

PTh. 2. Est au-  
tem duplex fi-  
delium Socie-  
tas, interna, sc.  
ac spiritualis,  
externa seu  
visibilis ac po-  
litica.

For the distinction of that *Communion* in the 2<sup>d</sup> second Thesis, into *internall* and *externall*, *visible* and *invisible*, we say that one onely member of the distinction belongs to the point in hand according to our stating of it. (And if the adversary of Geneva did presse the other, we do not defend him in it) viz. the *externall* and *visible* Society of Believers or Christian Professors, from which onely we affirm any man to be cut off by the act of *Excommunication*; and if he that is so cut off from that, be also finally cut off from the other, this is but *accidentall*, and very extrinsecall to that act, and distant from the design and end of it, being the effect onely of his sin, which, before he was *excommunicated* for it, is supposed to have concluded him under the wrath of God and of his *Condemnation*, which will not permit this most fatherly punishment of the Church to work any good upon him; to which though it be consequent indeed, that this censure obtaining not the desired effect, shall tend to his greater condemnation, yet will this consequent no more be chargeable on that censure, then on any other the methods of mercy or chastisement, by God used on purpose for his Reformation.

In

In the third Thesis it is by us acknowledged true, that inter-  
nall and externall society go not alwayes together; and the consequents which Erasmus  
builds on that, are true, and acknowledged in an unjust Excommunication, but  
these belong nothing at all to a just, nor  
consequently infer any thing against the  
institution, which giving rules that it  
may, and commands that it should be  
alwayes exercised justly, may be permitted  
to suppose it is so; or if by error or  
mis carriage it be not, it doth not exclude him from that inward  
Communion, that was not before excluded, (supposing that he  
behave himself meekly and Christianly under that unjust cen-  
sure) and if there be (as indeed there is) great difficulty to  
judge, whether the person thus to be excommunicated, be first  
excluded from the inward communion or no, yet will not  
this conclude the censures unlawfull, because if he be not quite  
out before, this puts him not out, (nor is occasion of doing  
so, any more then chastisement from God, which may possibly  
work impatience and blasphemy in the person, but is not of  
necessity, or in any propriety of causation to do so) but rather  
is a means of keeping him in, of setting him upon his guard, of  
awaking or rescuing him from the danger of falling out of it,  
(and then *abundans cautela non nocet*, he that is awake already  
will be never the worse for calling) and withall of exercising  
some Christian virtues in him, which might possibly lye use-  
lesse by him, if they were not thus imploy'd, and call'd out to  
practise.

To the fourth Thesis we say, that No man thinks, or accord-  
ing to our principles, hath any need to think, that any but  
God can joyn any to that internal Communion of Christ and  
the faithful, i.e. beget faith in any (nor consequently cut off  
any from it) unlesse ministerially, as *ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν κληρικών*,  
workers under, and with Christ, and so only by power derived from  
him, we pretend to do what in the censures is done toward it.

*Per solam fidem, quæ per charitatem est efficax, eorū eadem hinc per solam infidelitatem excidi-  
mus, proinde non potest nos huic inferre, aut eadem excludere, nisi qui fidem donare, eandemque  
nobis iterum auferre possit.*

To

Sect. 39.

Sect. 40.

Th. 4. Mem-  
bra quidem  
Christi effi-  
ciunt, i.e. inter-  
ne spirituali;  
Christi socie-  
ti conjungimur.



## Sect. 4.1

Th. 5. *Externæ verò visibilesq; Ecclesiæ consortes reddimur ejusdem fidei professione ejusdemque doctrinæ approbatione, denique eorundam sacramentorum usurpatione; in quo tria hæc insunt, in tantisper dum ei insunt, inter membra externi fidelium cætus computatur, etiamsi ad eternam spiritus & mentis communionem non pertingat.*

To the fifth Thesis, we answer that there is a mistake, for we are made *consortes externæ & visibilis Ecclesiæ*, Partakers of the external and visible Church, not onely by those three as they are the acts of the man who is so partaker, but to those three must be added a second notion of the third of these, which seems not here to be taken notice of, (though also the words are so set, that 'tis not excluded) and that is the act of the Church, first according to Christ's commission to the Apostles, in receiving them into the Church by Baptisme, and when for lapses and returns into sin they are excommunicate, restoring them by absolution, and at all fit times allowing them the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, in charity supposing them (as long as they are in the Church) such members as ought not to be denied that priviledge, and if they be not unworthy, effectually sealing to them the benefits of Christianity. From whence 'tis clear that such the *usurpatio Sacramentorum* may be, (*viz.* if he receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper that is not baptized, or that is justly excommunicate) that 'twill be perfectly an usurpation, and not sufficient to give him right to be reckon'd *inter membra externi fidelium cætus*, among the members of a visible Church.

Though *Sacramentorum usurpatio*, in proper speaking, suppose Baptisme, which is one of those Sacraments; yet *Sacramentorum participatio*, Thes. 6. signifying onely receiving the Lords Supper, I have reason to suppose it may do here too, and therefore I put in this.

Sect. 4.2. Th. 6. In the first part there is need of a distinction : for the

Th. 6. *Ergo qui ex Ecclesiæ communione externâ ejicitur (i.e. qui excommunicatur) vel ab omnibus hisce tribus, vel à duobus, vel ab uno tantum irmonetur, sed à duobus primis, nempe à confessione fidei, & à Christiana doctrinæ approbatione (sub qua volo verbi & doctrinæ auditionem comprehendere) repellitur nullus debet, quin potius hæc irritandi & quavis ratione adducendi sunt omnes. Quocirca relinquitur, ut qui excommunicatur, à solâ (ex tribus commemoratis) sacramento participatione prohibeatur. Huic, utrum inseparabiliter cohercat privati commercii negatio, an separari possit, postea considerabitur. Alias pænas non pertinere ad substantiam excommunicationis hujus certum est. Etenim possit eadem etiam non excommunicatus in fide & excommunicationis non in fide,*

Confession of Faith, and approbation of Christian Doctrine may be 1. Either Cordial, or Hypocritical. 2. Either Private or Publike. If it be Cordial, then 1. it makes me partaker of the inward Communion with Christ and his members, and supposes a man to be in that state, in which he that is, ought not to be Excommunicate, and so 'tis not *Tantus exis* it belongs not to this matter. If it be Hypocritical (as it will appear, if he that acknowledges Christ, & approves his doctrine with his mouth, denies it with his actions) then is it fit to bring the censure upon him, which he most hates and fears, to cast him out of the

the Church, which is onely his disguise and vizard, or turn him out of that hypocriticall confession of *Christ*, to display and lay open his *hypocrisie*, that he may be asham'd, and think good to reform, and to that end, to deny him the publick hearing of the Word, which it seems hath wrought so little good upon him, and to assure him that he shall not be accounted a Christian, unlesse his actions accord with his profession; All which you may mark is so far from deterring him from the cordiall Profession, that 'tis the most probable means to invite him to it. So again for private confession and approbation, (which belongs more to the *internall communion* again, then to the *externall*) we drive no man from that by *Excommunication*, but onely from publick performance of it in the Congregation (under which, and which only, the publick hearing of the Word read or preach'd is contained.) And by so doing we separate him from that visible Church on that charitable one purpose, that he may see how he hath abus'd that benefit, and timely learn to make better use of it, though again we do not invite him to that bare empty oral publick or private confession, or that oral approbation, which his hands, i.e. his actions confute, or that unprofitable bearing, which will onely heap judgement on him; yet on the other side are far from deterring him from the real publick confession, &c. but by thus dealing with him we shew him the necessity of it, and so by beating him out of his false holds, which will do him no good, drive (which is more then inviting) him to the true refuge or Sanctuary, the real confession, the effectuall approbation, & profitable bearing. To which head I must add, that I much wonder why all this while in the number of the constitutives of *external communion*, publick prayer is not mentioned (not so much as reductively, as here hearing of the Word is:) This ought to have been added, and then I shall add of it, that though that be a duty that men would be invited to, as vehemently as to any, yet 'tis lawfull to exclude any from this benefit in publick, when that exclusion may be a means most probable to awake a lethargick sinner.

By this it appears how groundlesse the last part of the sixth Th. is, That excommunication is only excluding from the Sacrament; for 'tis also from prayer, and hearing, (*viz.* in publick) as well as

Self. 43.

L

from

from the *Sacrament*: when that is thought expedient to reform any. Thus Tertul. mentions exclusion à *communicatione orationis, & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii*, Apol. c. 39. from partaking of Prayer and all sacred commerce: and generally the *xadagis* anciently was from all: (though the manner of receiving in penitents being first by admitting them to bearing, and then to partaking in the prayers, which were before those that are joyn'd with the communion, and after, to those prayers also, and in time to the Communion it self) it was after thought fit that some of the censures should not be totall to the excluding from all, but only setting them *inter audientes*, or *Catechumenos*, which were not yet admitted to the *Sacrament*, of which only the practise which he sets himself against seems to be an imitation. What follows therefore in the conclusion of that *Thesis*, that, [*quod alia pane non pertinent ad substantiam excommunicationis certum est.* 'Tis certain that other penalties belong not to the substance of excommunication] is very false, and proceeds from an ignorance, or willingness to deceive, as if the word *Excommunication* denoted only the keeping from the *Sacrament* of the Lords Supper (to which end, it now seems, it was, that the first *Thesis* was designed, and against whatsoever it is argumentative 'twill not be against us) whereas it denotes the excision from all, or any degree of *Communion* in *sacris*, and is a generical word, of which there be different species according to the several kinds of holy things (the *Word*, the *Prayers*, the *Sacraments*) from which one may be *excommunicate*; And that of exclusion from the *Sacrament* is one degree of exclusion, and the exclusion from either or both of the other also is an addition to that, never inflicted upon any but those to whom the *Sacrament* was denied. So far from truth is that which is added, that those other punishments *possunt non excommunicatis infligi*, may be inflicted upon those that are not *excommunicate* in his sense of *excommunicatus*, for one excluded from the *Sacrament*: for no man was denied prayers and bearing, that was admitted to the *Sacrament*, (nor is it rational that one should, for sure he that is thought worthy of the highest dignity and benefit in a Church, must be wronged if he be denied and thought incapable of the lowest) though the other part upon this reason be confest to be true, that

that these punishments of exclusion from prayers & bearing, may sometimes excommunicat is non infligi, be not inflicted upon them that are excommunicate: as he that is thought unworthy the Priests office, may yet be allowed to be one of the *Nethinim* or door-keepers, as in the antient Church, he that was suspended from the sacerdotal function was yet suffer'd to communicate, ut *Laicus*, as a *Laick*.

By which the answer is clear to the next Thesis as far as Sect. 44. concerns the *interdictio templorum*, exclusion

out of the Church (and for the other two, <sup>\*Th. 7. *Ad alē Pontificii propter hanc excommunicationem (quam ipsi minore appellarunt, ac solā sacramentorum negatione rectē definierunt) aliam insuper addiderunt, quam majorem & anathema vocarunt: atq; contra apertam Scripturam interdictio templorum, privati, commercii, & actus cujusvis liciti. i. definierunt, quoniam Apostolus 1 Cor. 14. palam ostendit neq; ethnicos neq; alios quoslibet, à divini verbi auditione, lectione, gratiarū actionibus, ac precibus Christianorū prohibitas fuisse.*</sup> that of the private commerce, & actus cujusvis liciti, of doing any lawful act, we interpose not) i.e. from all the parts of the publick service, which that it was brought into the Church by the Pontificians, or that it is contra apertam Scripturam, against manifest Scripture, is certainly so very far from truth, that no man that hath read any part of antiquity, can doubt of this practise and usage, before the tyranny of Popery is affirm'd by any to have come into the world; and for the second, what that aperta Scriptura is, I shall not divine, but resolve that if it be that which is named in the end of the Thesis, 1 Cor. 14. there is nothing at all concluding from thence. The verse that seems to be referred to (for we are left to divine) is v. 23. or 24. where the speaking in the Church, praying or prophesying, &c. in an unknown tongue, is by St Paul proved to be improper, and not to tend to edification, because prophesying, i.e. explaining of Scripture, praying, singing of Psalmes, &c. being designed for the use of the believers, and no others, are in any reason to be in a known tongue, that they may understand. and joyn in them, v. 16. the unknown tongues being designed, either only as a sign, v. 22. i.e. a miracle to convert unbelievers to the faith; when they see illiterate men all Jews speak all kinds of languages, or as a means of preaching to men of every country in their own language, from whence, saith the Apostle, 'tis consequent that if unknown tongues were used in a congregation of believers, unlearned men that understand not those tongues, or unbelievers that have no reverence to the Congregation, & do not at all discern any miracle in their speaking with

divers tongues, but look only upon the ridiculousnesse of the action, as of a gabbling of that which no man understands, will resolve that this is a direct madnesse thus to do. Whereas on the other side that of *Propheying*, interpreting of the doctrine of Christ intelligibly, and the other parts of the *Church-Service* in a known language, will be apt to convince, or instruct those *unbelievers* or *ignorants*; This, and no more but this, is the direct rationally importance of those verses; wherein though there be mention of *unbelievers coming in*, yet that being only by way of supposition [*if they come in, &c.*] I might justly say, that that is no plain affirmation of Scripture, that *heathens*, & *alii quilibet*, any others that will, are not prohibited the hearing of Gods word, &c. For, 1. 'tis an old rule, that *suppositio non ponit*, the supposing (*if they do*) doth not suppose they do, much lesse that lawfully they may: and 2. that text names only *ethnicks* and *ignorants*, and belongs not at all to the *alii quivis*, any other that will, as that contains the impenitent *Christians*, which are the only persons, to which our *Excommunication* belongs; and of them the Apostle is far from affirming or supposing, that they might not be so excluded, and if they should by way of reduction be forced into that verse, the *Apostles* reasons would be spoiled, for they being supposeable to understand that *unknown tongue* (as they may do for all their impenitence) at least to know what belongs to the gift of tongues, and to what use they were designed, would not think them mad presently that used it; which being said, I may further add, that those *heathens* coming into the *Church*, or the not prohibiting them to enter, is a very distinct thing from the admission of the impenitent *Christians*, when they are by *Church censures* prohibited, because the *Apostle* himself which prohibits *Communion* with the brother (that is, the *Christian*) which is a fornicator, doth yet not prohibit it with an *heathen* or fornicator of this world; and the end of *Excommunication* being only on design of charity, to make the *Christian* offender by that means ashamed, and reformable, would be utterly cast away upon an *heathen*, who would rather be made obdurate by that means; and indeed 'twere ridiculous to turn out them who are not so forward to come in, and are not by *S<sup>t</sup> Paul* here supposed so, unlesse *tanquam exploratores*, to see how *Christians* behave them-



themselves there, and if they can finde any such madnesse amongst them, as he there mentions, would be likely to charge it home upon them; though on the other side if they finde such a regular frame, and beauty of all things there, they may possibly be convinced, and wrought on by that admirable order, & doctrine, as *St Austin* was by *St Ambroses* Sermon, though he came thither on a quite distant errand. And so sure all this while this is a feeble text to be relyed on, as the only argument to conclude *Apostolicall* practise to be contrary to the excluding of any *à Verbi Divini auditione*, &c. from prayer, or from hearing the Word in publick, the place being quite extrinsecal to this matter, and saying nothing at all to it.

That which hath been said, sufficiently arms us against the Sect. 45. conclusivity of that which *1 Th. 8.* is infer'd

from the premises, and therefore there is no need of saying more to it; save onely this, that in this *Thesis* there are some little mistakes committed, which I shall only name, 1. (that which is to the matter in hand, and on which his conclusion stands, or falls, and had been mentioned and is by us answered before in the *1. Th.*) that (*κοινωνία*) *1 Cor. 10.*

signifies *Communion*, whereas, I say, it signifies indeed (from *κοινωνέω* *communico*) *communicatio*, and so belongs there quite to another matter then that, to which it is here apply'd) only to the affirming the wine, &c. in the *Sacrament* to be the *communication*, or the making us partakers of the blood of Christ, not to our *Communion* one with another in *sacra*, which is the thing from which *excommunication* cuts us off, as is noted by that definition of it, which *Thes. 1.* is by the author produced, that 'tis *exclusio à societate & communione fidelium*, an exclusion from the society of beleivers. A second mistake (besides that which is consequent to the former, a new definition of it by only *Sacramentorum interdictio*, *Interdictio* of, or exclusion from the *Sacraments*, which should more unlimitedly have been *Sacrorum*, from holy things) that *Sacramentorum* is put in the plural number, which must needs be either not like a *Divine*, or not like a *Protestant*; for if it note *Baptisme* as well as the *Lords Supper*, then

*1 Th. 8. Ex dictis liquet excommunicationem nihil aliud esse, quàm publicam & solennem sacramentorum, praesertim sanctae dominicae (quam privatim Apostolus communionem (κοινωνίαν) appellat, ut de principio dictum fuit) interdictionem, praesente seniore cognitione: quo peccantes respiciant, rursusque ad sacramentorum perceptionem admittantur.*

'tis not like a *Divine*, for no *Divine* would say that *Excommunication* is an *Interdiction* of *Baptisme*; for till they are once baptized, they are out of the *Church*, are not capable of *Excommunication*; and when they are once baptized, though they were not *excommunicate*, they should be baptized no more. But if by that *plural*, he mean any other *Sacraments* besides these two, that is not like a *Protestant*, for such acknowledge no more. Having mention'd these two mistakes, I shall not add a third, that in this interdiction, the persons to whom this cognizance belongs, are not rightly named, because though it be true, that they are not, yet the men against whom he wrote were of that opinion; and I am a little perswaded, that if it had been an *Episcopal* audience, that should have had this cognizance, he had never written this book, nor been put upon those arts to evacuate the *Church-censures*. One thing only I may have leasure to commend in that *Thesis*, that he defines *Excommunication* by *publica & solennis interdictio*, a publick *solemn Interdiction*, & *pre-eunte cognitione* (I suppose he means *legitimâ*) with a *legall cognizance* preceding it, and shall add, that they quite deform the *Primitive Institution*, who deny the *Sacrament* to whole *Congregations* at once without any charge laid to all or any part of them, (save only that they are a mixt *Congregation*, wherein there are some evil men, which yet is not *legally* proved neither) and they also who deny it to particular men sufficiently catechised, without any publick cognizance of their crime, or process of *admonition* first, and second, or that design that exclusion to any other end, then *ut peccantes resipiscant*, the reducing sinners to repentance : and therefore no small petty trifle is a sufficient matter for this, but contumacious continuing in some scandalous sin after admonitions, from which when they return again by a sincere and proved repentance, they are to be absolved.

## Sect. 46.

<sup>z</sup> Th. 9. is the proposing of the question in the termes, wherein it is to be handled, wherein I shal only interpose for perspicui-

*titur questio, utrum aliquis propter commissum peccatum aut vitam impuriæ actam, siquidem usurpare Sacramenta cum cæteris Christianis cupiat, ab eorundem usu & perceptione sit remuendus? questio de eo proponitur, qui eandem fidem nobiscum profitetur, Ecclesie per baptismum insertus est, atq; doctrinâ ab ead. non dissentit (ut in Th. 5. posuimus) sed in solâ vitâ & moribus errat. Hoc ergo queritur, utrum in S. literis vel mandatum vel exempli aliquod extet, quo tales jubeantur aut doceantur à Sacramentis submoverti?*

ty sake, that the phrase [*an remouendus sit?*] may have a little ambiguity in it, for perhaps it may (though lesse properly) be set to signifie this, *Whether it be lawfull to remove such an one?* (for if it be but so, then he that pretends to write against *excommunication*, and to pretend it *unlawfull*, will be sufficiently concluded) and then I answer, that for any but for the *Governor* of the *Church*, to whom the cognizance of his ill life belongs, and who hath had a legal cognizance of it, and proceeded legally by the severall degrees of *Ecclesiastical* proceſſe against him, it is not lawfull: but for the *Bishop*, or *Preſent*, or lawfull *Governour* succeeding to that power which *Christ* gave his *Apostles* with the *Keyes of the Kingdome of heaven*, it is lawfull, and by the commission of [*Ego dabo*] and afterwards [*ego mitto*] they are sufficiently authorized to do this: and upon this issue, if this be it, we will joyn most willingly. But then secondly, the (*An sit remouendus*) may perhaps (and to that the words more incline) denote a necessity of doing it, and then the question will be, whether he *must be removed*? To which I then answer, that there lies not any such necessity on this, as arises from any *pollution* that will accrue to others that *communicate* with him, if he be not prohibited, any further then the *example* of his sin, and the impunity may extend, and this the *Fathers* maintained against the *Novatians*. Nor thirdly, any necessity lying on the *Minister* that administers, for he having admonished (according to our *Church Orders* in our *Liturgy*) every such sinner to go home, and repent, and not to approach to that table, is in *charity* to believe (being not able to *search the heart*) that he, that after that so comes, is a true penitent. Only if in *prudence* he think it unlikely, and therefore out of care to a poor mans soul, and for the preventing of the sin of *unworthy* receiving, he think fit to admonish him more privately, or particularly to that end, or to do any thing else, which in *prudence* may contribute to it, this is but his duty to an *erring* brother, and when that is done, any farther emergent guilt lies upon the receiver, and he is not (in case of the mans *unworthy* receiving) partaker of that sin.

All the necessity then that is in this matter, lies first upon the receiver himself, that he be wary, that he come not till he be prepared (and that belongs not to our present consideration) and

Sett. 47.

and upon the *Bishops*, or *Governours of the Church*, that when *charity* to souls requires it of them, they fail not thus to proceed, that when *mercy* and friendly admonitions prevail not, they then take in *severity*, the *Apostles* rod in the season for a *rod*, in stead of his *Spirit of mercy*, and *meeknesse*, and to that end be watchfull over the flock, that they fall not into such dangers, and infections, by their neglect or mercifulnesse.

Señ. 48.

As for the qualifying of the persons, of whom this question is ask'd, I shall not differ with the Proposer, but resolve, as anon we shall shew, that he that is thus, may (and ought in the sense that I mention) be thus dealt with, and we shall joyn issue with him for the precept and examples of Scripture commanding and teaching us to do so.

Señ. 49.

And having now, as I conceive, so easie a task before me, and such an army of seconds on my side (the consent and practise of the whole Christian world for 1500 years) against one single combatant, walking in a melancholy posture by himself (till after so many years, the concurrence of some accidentall conceived *conveniencies* have at last helpt him to some company) And him again not very much used to the *weapon* (I mean *Divinity*) which he hath undertaken to trust to, and beside having an advantage against him, which he did not foresee, we of this Church being not the men against whom his reasons were framed, and so not so like to be prest by them, (the arguments designed against *Beza* and his *Presbyterians* being utterly unconvincient against us) I must confesse my self to be under a temptation to make use of the present advantage, and to prosecute this triall to the uttermost; but I must in justice consider, what a chafme and rent it would make in this discourse, what an untweldy bulk it would swell it to, and therefore must recover so much constancy of minde, as not to be thus passionately hurried out of my resolution, but leave it, till I have a louder call to it, being ready to give any man an account of what I now say in this matter.

Señ. 50.

It will be a more moderate excursion, and more reconcilable with my designed brevity, to mention one opinion or pretension more in this matter, that of another *Gentleman*, who though he strive not to take *Excommunication* out of the Church

P. 369:

any

any more then Baptisme, but moreover acknowledges also, that it belongs to the future Pastor as well as to the then present Apostles, yet having first resolved, that Ecclesiastical or Christi-  
*anorum* are all one, he then concludes that the cognizance and judgment of any fault, whether it be such or no belongs to the Church in that notion of his, i.e. to the City or Commonwealth, (which with him also signifies the civil Magistrate, or, as he saith, *iudicem summum*, the supreme judge) and that the power of binding and loosing (as that also of baptizing, which saith he is all one with it) is no farther in the Pastor, then that he eject those out of the Church, whom the Church in his notion hath condemned; and receive into it, whom the Church judges worthy of absolution. I shall not labour to multiply differences, but at this time make my exceptions onely to one part of this Scheme, viz. that the Church in his notion, i.e. the *iudex summus*, the civil Magistrate, hath the power of judging, who are to be excommunicated, who absolved. The proofs that I can collect from him of that assertion, are only two; First, that Mat. 18. Christ bids, in case the trespasser hear not the two or three, i.e. saith he either deny the fact, or confessing it deny it to be a trespass, then say Ecclesia, that it should be told the Church; [*Quare autem Ecclesiæ nisi ut ipsa iudicet an peccatum sit, necne?* Why should the Church be told it, but that that may judge whether that be a sin or no? ] and if he obeyed not, then let him be to thee a Publican, &c. Non dicit, Dic Apostolicè, It is not, saith he, Tell the Apostles, to note that the sentence or judgement, whether it be a sinne or no, belongs not to them, but to the Church; and consequently that this power was no more, then to bind those whom the Church had before judged impenitent. His second argument is from the practise and words of St. Paul, who asks the Corinthians [Do you not judge them that are within?] yet himself pronounces the fornicator excommunicate. To the former of these, I shall answer onely this one thing, that there are other reasons very prompt, & pertinent, why the matter should be told the Church, though the Church be taken in a notion wherein it is not supposed to judge of it: as either, 1. the [den] are inculcationibus in Tertullians phrase, the fortifying the former successfulle reprehensions with this addition of authority from the number, that as the two or three might be more likely to work upon the offender, then



the injur'd person alone, so now the *magistratus* or the *sanctus*, the many, or the Church in the loosest notion of it, for any assembly or meeting of many Christians together, (supposing that it do not signify the Governors of the Church, as the Antients yet say it doth, and is far more probable, and asserted on stronger grounds, then that it should signify the *Civitas* or *summus iudex*) might probably be more effectual; or 2. The [*iudicare coram multis*] formerly cited out of the *Rabbins*, the making the offender ashamed when his fact is thus publick, and to do that is by its acknowledged the end of the admonitions, and censures; or 3. If there be need, the using the multitude as a cloud of witnesses to convince him of the fact, or sinfulness of it, which the text refers to before, (that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established) and in all reason may be a commodious sense here also, this third being but the ascending to an higher, and more probable convincing course, when the former had miscarried. Either of these three, much more altogether, will be a sufficient ground of Telling it to the Church, and so from thence there is no necessity to conclude that the judgement is the act of the Church, or Civil Magistrate in that place. And indeed it will be hard to suppose that possible at that time, when 'tis clear the Civil Magistrate was not Christian, and therefore unfit not only for the title of the Church, but much more to be appealed to as the judge by Christians, who, 'tis certain, are bound by Christ to use all other means possible (and telling it to the Church in our notion is one of those possibles) to get satisfaction for trespasses, before they proceed to any heathen tribunal, to implead their fellow-Christian there. Nor will it, I conceive, be reasonable to reply, that Christ's speech belongs to aftertimes, when the Magistrate should be Christian; For then, 1. he must acknowledge that till then, it was to be in the Church in our notion, and consequently that the Ecclesiastical Governors were the Judge at that time, and then by his own doctrine (that *data est potestas ligandi, &c. futuris pastoribus eodem modo quo presentibus Apostolis*) it will still belong to the Ecclesiastical Superior. And 2. though it may very justly be extended to that future state, (as what was said to the Apostles was not personal, but belovged to their successors also) yet there will be no probable argument that  
the

the *Apostles* then present should be themselves excluded. For he  
 siders that this must lie on him to prove, if he will assert it against  
 all antiquity; it will also be a little unreasonable to affirm, for  
 that were for our Saviour to give all the power, and direct all  
 the speech to the *Successors*, not to the *Apostles*, as a *Prophecy* on-  
 ly, or a prediction, no *Evangelical* insisting on these to whom  
 he spake. This I suppose a sufficient answer to this proof, with-  
 out proceeding to any deeper search or examination of that  
 which in the argument is taken for granted, viz. that the Church  
 signifies the *Summus iudex*, which yet is as far from being for-  
 merly convincingly inferred, as it is from the sound of the  
 words, or the notion, wherein all the *ancient Church* have uni-  
 formly taken it, (which will, I hope, be considerable in this  
 matter) for that *Christ* did not take upon him to be a *Judge*, or  
 introduce any change in *civil Government*, as it is by us acknow-  
 ledged most true, so will it not belong to this of *binding*, &c.  
 which is but a *spiritual*, not *civil* punishment, only a denying  
 them that, which *Christ* brought into the world, and gave those  
*Messengers* of his the sole power of disposing it, and indow'd them  
 with power from on high, particularly for the exercise of it. As for  
 the second argument, 'tis certainly a mistake, if it be thought to  
 conclude that the *Apostle* did but pronounce the judgement of the  
 Church in that matter of the *incestuous*, or that the judgement of  
 the *civil* state was preparative to his. For sure the *Apostle* had,  
 (before the using of those words of [Do not you judge them that  
 are within?]) in the end of that *Chapt.*) pass'd his sentence defini-  
 tive on that *incestuous* in the beginning of it, ver. 3. For I have  
 already (not ego autem, but *ego & dei spiritus*) in absent in body, but present in  
 spirit, judg'd him that hath thus done this thing, and hath brought  
*blasphemy* and *war*, I have judg'd this evil done: Judg'd, I say, and what  
 is the sentence? Why, In the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you and  
 my spirit being met together (the *Apostle* and his *Presbytery*, or he  
 in the face of the Church) with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 to deliver such an one to Satan, &c. And this at a time when 'tis  
 clear, the Church had not pass'd sentence on him, for ver. 2. They  
 were put up, as he complains, and through an opinion of their  
 own deeper wisdom (a *heaven*, v. 6. i.e. a doctrine either of the  
 heathen philosophers, or of the *Gnosticks* among them) took it for

1 Cor. 5. 12.

an indifferent thing; and did not mourn for him that had done it, The ceremony used by the Church, when any was to be excommunicate, and notes that they should have so joynd together in mourning, in complaining to the *Apostle*, and prayer to *Christ*, that this censure might passe on such an one, but that they did not do it, nay, it seems proceeded not so far as to fraternal correction which was infallibly their duty toward him. As for the words cited; [*Nemo vos iudicet*?] they come in on another incidental occasion (not directly to this first matter) to make the distinction betwixt the dealing with the *Christian* and *heathen* fornicators; the *Apostle* restraining his prescription of not conversing with fornicators, v. 9. to the *Christian* fornicator, whom, saith he being within the Church, 'tis reasonable to conclude within the Churches censures, &c. and *Vos ipsi iudicatis*. Do you not judge them that are within? not you emphatically or in opposition to the *Apostle*, but you know as a general title of *Christians*, who use not to judge any but *Christians*, all other being left to Gods judgement, the Church having nothing to do with them. It is clear enough, that the context looketh wholly that way, and consequently there will be little reason to extend these words any farther then this, that the Church judgeth, *Christian* not *heathens*; and the Church in the notion only wherein 'tis opposed to God, not in which 'tis opposed to *S. Paul*, but in which in any reason it includes the *Apostle* or Governor of it; For sure he may judge them that are *vs*, within the Church, (for so he doth, v. 3. and no part of the context of that Ch. seems to say any thing to the contrary) though them that are without be cannot; which is the only thing the *Apostle* had in hand to say at that time.

Having briefly answered the reasons, I shall by way of compounding the Controversie with this Gentleman, most willingly acknowledge, that somewhat the Church in his notion, or more clearly the supreme Magistrate, being supposed *Christian*, may have to do in this businesse of Censures; precedaneous to the judgement of the *Apostle*, or before the Pastor or Ecclesiastical Governor proceed to them, As 1. in the choosing or nominating him to that office; 2. In the setting of rules, or laws by which he ought to proceed in hearing or judging: No question, this may and in *Christian* Common-wealths very reasonably ought to be.

belong to the *Civil Magistrate*; and truly this discourse doth not pretend to, or desire any unlimited, or arbitrary power in the *Bishop*, but only that, the rules being prudently set by those to whom the power of making laws belongs in every Commonwealth, he should have the cognizance in such causes, as regularly belong to his audience, and according to that rule, & not otherwise, give sentence on the offender, and that only thus far, that he shall be turn'd out of *Christian Society*, or received into it again: (which, beside that this is, and hath alwayes been taken for an institution of *Christ*, which 'tis reasonable we should obey, and not dispute, is also in it self simply considered, far from any degree of unreasonable, no man in ordinary reason being more fit to judge who is fit to enjoy the privileges of the Church, who likely to be reformed by being deprived of them, then he that hath studied that great skill of winning souls, and is intrusted by *Christ* with the charge of them.) Again 3. it will be granted that the Church in the ordinary notion, as it signifies the whole diffusive *Christian Society* in any place, may so far be interest'd in this matter, as that these only shall be liable to these Censures, who have offended others by their notorious sins, and are by the *Proxies*, as it were of those others, I mean, by their chosen officers, or by the publick fame, the voyce again and interpreter of their sense, delated, or complain'd of to the Governours of the Church, as those that have wrong'd the Church, and defamed that *Christian Profession*, to which they had given up their names; and this is a kind of judging (in large or loose speaking, as to be infamous offenders signifies to be conceiv'd and judg'd such by the community among whom they live, for otherwise they are not infamous) but yet in strict propriety, is only a preparative to the sentence of the Judge, and an accusing or impleading rather, and is not, I suppose, the thing for which this Author doth pretend, or if it were, would not to us be matter of contention with him.

The truth is, the power of binding, &c. which we content for, as the office more then privilege of *Bishops*, (In the careful exercise of which they minister most charitably to the good of the souls intrusted to them) is another manner of thing, then what this Gentleman seems to have conceived it (both here, and especially

p. 407.

a AR. 3. 26.

b *Finis hujusmodi disciplina erat ut destituti ad tempus gratia & privilegiis Ecclesiæ spiritualibus, humiliarentur ad salutem.*

p. 407.

c *Doctrina quedam quibus imbuti cives obedientiam civitati negavi, & contra Principes summos, summasque potestates pugnare, idque jure posse, imo oportere arbitrantur.* p. 101.

d *Nam quod bellum civile in Orbe Civitiano unquam exiit quod ab hac radice ortum atque altum non fuerit?* p. 102.

p. 190.

cially when of it he concludes, *Unusquisque si mentis compos sit obediat in omnibus simpliciter ei, cuius arbitrio credit se salvandum aut damnandum esse.*) God knows they pretend to no such arbitrium in the saving or damning of any man; It is only an engine of Christs invention to make a battery and an impression on the obdurate sinner to win him to himself to <sup>a</sup>blesse, not to triumph over him; (which very thing he hath in one place excellently express'd, <sup>b</sup> *The end of this discipline, saith he, is by depriving men for a time of the favour and spiritual privileges of the Church, to humble them to salvation,*) much lesse to invade any part of civil Judicature, or loosen the bands thereof by these spiritual pretences, but to leave the Government of the world just in the posture that it was before Christs coming, or as it would be supposed to be, if he had never left any Keyes in his Church. And therefore, when in an *Annotation* affixt to his last Edition he was pleas'd to extend his observation of the <sup>c</sup> *Doctrines* that might disturb Government, not only to that power which many attribute to the Pope of Rome in other mens dominions, and to the liberty usurpt by the Cives infimi, under pretence of Religion, but also to that which *alicubi extra Ecclesiam Romanam Episcopi in civitate sua sibi postulant*, I must hope that it was a mistake, or which I rather think (being perswaded of the uprightness of his affections to our establish'd Government) that his [*alicubi*] did not in any wise refer (as I was apt to fear it did) to the constitution of *Episcopacy* in this native Kingdome of his and mine. For that this, since it departed from the *Roman Church*, hath been perfectly free from any degree of that guilt, is that of which we are so far perswaded, that we neither fear, nor deprecate any *Historians* instance, nor can I imagine what one particle of the doctrine, or constitution of our Church there is, on which a rational man can by any consequence build such a <sup>d</sup> charge. Of which nothing can make *Us* capable, but leaving the [*non*] out of it; and that makes me a little confident, that either [*Episcopi*] in that place signifies not in the known vulgar *Christian* sense, or that the [*alicubi*] lookt not on this Kingdome or Church of ours (as it hath long stood establish'd by Law) which most cheerfully acknowledges the truth of his many other observations, (particularly that of *Obedience due to the Moses's, not Aarons chair, of Abiathar the High-*



High-priest being no way exempt from the command of Solomon, of his three axioms also concerning Excommunication, that neither the Common-wealth, nor the supreme Magistrate, nor all the persons in any Common-wealth can be excommunicate) and resolves that no man shall ever deprive her of this glorying, that she is pure from the blood of all men, hath entertain'd no one principle, or doctrine in any degree incompatible with the civil power, or peace in the utmost extent, in which the most loyal author hath design'd to establish it. And if it must be Arminianism (as one hath lately confuted it under that title) to teach that the Ecclesiastical power is subjected to the Civil Magistrate, who in all causes over all persons is acknowledged by us supreme under Christ, we must be content to lye down under that envie, and not excuse or renounce that piece of *Loyal Arminianism*.

p. 192.  
p. 371 372.

*Errant primò  
Arminian. qui  
Magistratus  
Politico Eccle-  
siasticum regi-  
men subiectum  
esse docebant.*

I have thus far proceeded in this matter for the removing of prejudices, and vindicating our proposition from three sorts of objecters: 'tis now time to advance a little toward the positive assertive part, and to that end (the knowledge of *loosing* depending wholly from the consideration of *binding*) I shall in the first place examine what images of *binding* we have in the Scripture, and those we shall refer to two heads: first, those that belong to the power, and practise *Apostolical*, (in the time and persons of the *Apostles*) secondly, those that after the *Apostles* persons, (and ever since) were to continue in the Church, which we shall call *Ecclesiastical Discipline* (as distant from *Apostolical*) exercised (the one, as the other) upon offenders either publick and scandalous, or whose crimes otherwise came unto their cognizance; and consisting either in *separating* and *removing* to some distance, or in casting them totally out of the Church, or Congregation of visible Professors here on earth; answerable unto which, [*loosing*] must consequently be a delivering from those censures; the absolving of him, who was formerly separated, or excommunicated, restoring him to the visible Church, or any part thereof (to the privileges of a *Christian*, and the comforts of the Word, and Services; and Sacraments) who was before legally cast out of it, and deprived of them.

Secl. 51.

For the understanding of which, and specially of the former, the *Apostolical* power and practise (or as it was discernable among

among the *Apostles*) it will not be amiss to do these three things: 1. To give you a view of the several sorts of *Excommunication* among the *Jews*, to which some phrases in the New Testament refer: (because I see there is some controversy raised concerning them.) 2. To mention some of those places in the New Testament, which seem to refer to these; And then 3. to observe the phrases in the New Testament, which are more purely *Christian*, i.e. which more distinctly and peculiarly respect the use of these *Censures* among *Christians*.

Señ. 52.

For the first, I am sure, 'twill be no news to say that there were three degrees of *Excommunication* among the *Jews*; the first called *אִפְסוּרָה* *ap̄sura* remotion or separation; the second, *אִרְדָּמָה* *ardama* Execration, a more solemn *Excommunication* with curses out of *Moses* Law and execrations added to it, a *Neḡ* of which we have *Lev. 24. 10.* inflicted on him who after the *7<sup>th</sup>* first for 30 dayes, and then being allowed 30 dayes more (which is doubling of the *7<sup>th</sup>*) still continued in that contumacy, for then, say the *Jews* *אִתְּחַלְלֵהוּ* they anathematize him without defining any limited time, as before in *Niddui* they did. The third is *נִדְדוּי* a kind of *Proscription* and delivering to desolation and destruction; or to the coming of the Lord in judgement against him, noted by *מַעֲבֵד אֱלֹהִים* (added to the *anathema*) *ma'eb̄d* in the *Oriental* tongues signifying *Dominus*; whence in *Etruria* the *Kings* are called *Murani*, saith *Servius* in *Æn. 12.* and the *Syrians* now *Maranite*, because they call Christ *מָרְנָה* our Lord. Agreeable to which it is, that in *Epiphanius*, God is by the *Gazari* call'd *Marnas*, and by the *Cretians* their virgins *Maeyni*, i.e. *uexius Ladies*, as among the *Spaniards* the form hath been used, *Sit anathema Marano*, & *excommunicatus*, or *אִתְּחַלְלֵהוּ מִתְּהוֹמַת הַיְיָ* Let him be excommunicate from the hope of the Lord: (and though he that loves not the Lord *Iesus Christ* be not *1 Cor. 16. 22.* appointed to be excommunicated by that phrase, yet doth it referre to the use of the phrase among the *Jews*, though there it be by way of accommodation set to signifye another matter, that higher more direful sentence of (*Go you cursed, &c.*) Of these three species thus set down in *Leviticus*, I should not add much more, but that again I see two things resolved on by a fore-mentioned learned *Author*, contrary to what hath

hath been generally received in this matter, and the latter of them are, if believed, to direct the Church of all kinds of discipline, even of such as was instituted on no other design but to bring sinners to heaven, and which we desire should be used onely to that end. They are these, 1. That there are but two species of Excommunication among the Jews, *Niddui* and *Cherem*, and that *Schammatha* is all one with *Niddui*. 2. That these punishments among the Jews belonged not to exclusion from sacred, but only from civil society.

Sec. 53.

For the first of these, that which I find produced to disprove those three species, is, 1. The promiscuous use of *Niddui* and *Schammatha* among the Talmudical writings. Secondly, the derivation of *Schammatha* from *QW* which among them signifies no more then to separate and to abrogate; and thirdly, that *Eliar Levita*, and *David de Pomis*, which are for these three species, were not Lawyers, but Grammarians, and so did *oscitant* negligently and drowsily make three species of Excommunication, when they should have made but two. To all which I answer, that those learned men which maintain the three species may very well do it for ought these objections enforce to the contrary. For it will not be necessary for us to affirm that the Talmudists should use these several words constantly according to their distinct, proper, peculiar, critical importance; there is nothing more ordinary then for words that are used *in foro* to lose their native proper significations, and to be used *non*, for somewhat else of affinity, and near signification with them; and therefore it will be worth observing, that as *Schammatha* in the Talmud is sometimes taken only for separation (which is the reason that they which are against the three species make *Schammatha* to be all one with *Niddui*, and to set down *Niddui* and *Cherem* for the two:) So in other places *Niddui* is set to denote *Schammatha* as a higher degree then *Cherem*, as will appear to any that cannot otherwise pass judgement on it, by the places which Buxtorf hath produced in his *Rabbinical Lexicon*, which shew clearly that *Schammatha* is a heavier degree of Excommunication, and yet that *Niddui* is by them put for *Schammatha*, which indeed will be a proof that *Niddui* and *Schammatha* are used promiscuously, & *sine discrimine* among those writers,

P. 2467.

ters, but not at all, that there are but two degrees or species *Niddui* and *Schammatha*; but clearly the contrary, that *Cherem* is a middle species beyond which there is *Schammatha*; which they sometimes improperly call *Niddui* as well as below it *Niddui*, which they sometimes call *Schammatha*; and therefore *Jo. Cocb* which is cited to prove that *Niddui* & *Schammatha* are all one, saith withall, that *CCC* and *CCC*, *non tantum de leuorifed & de grauioribus differenter usurpantur*, etc. *Gem. San. p. 146.* both used for the greater, as well as both for the lighter Excommunication. To which I shall add, that the *Hebr.* writers are so far from speaking constantly, and exactly, & critically in this matter, that they sometimes put *Cherem*, or *anathema* to *weft*, and ad *Schammatha* to that, and then set *Niddui* as the last of the three, as in *Jelam-medenu* sect. *XXI*. speaking of the *Samaritans*, the species of Excommunication are thus enumerated, *CCC* *CCC* *CCC* and they anathematized, and schammathized and excommunicated him, by which it will appear, how promiscuously those words have been used among *Hebr.* writers, (to which purpose may be again remembered, what was even now produced of the phrase in Spain, *Sit anathema macto, & excommunicatus, excommunicatus* after the highest *anathema*;) but it will not be a proof of any validity, against the three species of Excommunication, or the order or difference of them, when they do speak exactly.

Sect. 54.

For the second proof taken from the derivation of *Schammatha* from *CCC*, which, saith he, signifies no more then to separate or abdicate, I desire this may be noted, that there is no such ancient *Hebrew* word as *CCC* but only of later use among the *Rabbins*, and *Talmudists*, which to me is an argument convincing that that verb may come from *Schammatha*, and not *Schammatha* from the verb; and therefore *Buxtorf*, when he meets with it, renders it *Schammathizare*; as a verbal from that noun, not willing to affix any other Interpretation to it, but this, that so he might leave it to signify in the same latitude (as a verb) that belongs to *Schammatha*, as a substantive, i.e. sometimes to be taken properly and strictly to denote the third species; sometimes improperly, to be all one with *Niddui*, or the first species.

Sect. 55.

For the confirming of what I now say, I shal premise what  
suppos

suppose will be easily granted me, that every compound or derivative Hebrew word, is to be reduced to some original Hebrew root or roots, from which it is derived, or of which it is compounded; consequently that the same must be resolved of *שחממ*, which that it is not a derivative from *שחח* I conceive is sufficiently evinc'd, because *שחח* is no primitive Hebrew word to be found in the Bible, or other authentick Hebrew writing (which he that will not trull his own observation, but survey Schaller and Buxtorf, will acknowledge with me) but only among the *Rabbin* and *Talmudists*, and may rather be thought to come from *שחח* than *Schammaiba* from that; this is not my conjecture, but the direct words of the learned Buxtorf, in his *definition of Hebrew Epistles* p. 48. in these words, *Talmudist ex nomine שחח verbum factum שחממ proferibere, proferentibus patitur in aliquem ferre* the *Talmudists* from the noun *Schammaiba* make the verb *Schammaib*, to proscribe, &c. and though Buxtorf in his *Rabbinical Lexicon* place the verb before the noun, yet is that no argument of disagreement between these two writings, but is only caused by a care of observing his wonted literal method of setting the verb of the three letters before the noun of one letter more.

If it be demanded of me from whence then the noun comes, (seeing I make the verb come from that) I answer that learned Jews have given it several *origination*s, some bringing it from **דָּנָה** **דָּנָה** *Dannah Venah, the Lord comes*, making it all on with *נָשָׂא*, 1 Cor. 16. 22. (but the dagesh in **נָשָׂא** makes me that I cannot consent to that Etymology) others from **נָשָׂא** **נָשָׂא** *Ubi mors, there is death*; others from **נָשָׂא** **נָשָׂא** *defolatio erit, there shall be defoliation*. Of these two latter I know not which to choose, 1. having little objection against either of them, and 2. finding them both *allowed* in the Gemara Moed Katan, in these words, what is Schaminath? Rab answered **נָשָׂא** **נָשָׂא** *there is death*, and Samuel said, **נָשָׂא** **נָשָׂא** *there shall be defoliation*, &c. and 3. finding the sense of both those originations to come to the same purpose of death, or defoliation, or destruction, noting that kinde of offenders be by that censure given up to divine vengeance, which is generally the notion of that 3 degree of Excommunication, which makes it to be taken for the same with Maranatha in the Apostle; that God comes as a Judge or avenger

Сект. 56.

25.37.



to such an one. For let me add to this matter this one thing; that this third degree of censure among the Jews at Christs time, was proper to him, that under *Mosaic Law* had deserved death, but by reason that the power of capital punishments was taken from the Jews, could not by them be so punished; and therefore was by this way thus delivered up to Gods hands, to inflict vengeance upon him, which they say did very frequently befall them in a remarkable manner; and *S. Austins* observation is to this purpose, *quest. super Deut. l. 5. c. 38. Hoc nunc agit in Ecclesia excommunicatio, quod agebat tunc interfectio. Excommunicatio doct the same among Christians, that killing did among the Jews.* As for the third proof of the objection, taken from the lessening of the authority of *Eliu Lewis*, and *David de Pomis*, it will be sufficient to say, 1. That to make that argumentative, it ought to have been (but is not) proved, that others which have call'd the three species in question, are of greater authority then these. 2. That *Grammarians* (if they be such indeed, as those have been allowed that reputation) are Criticks also, and so as fit to be hearkned unto in such a matter of ancient custome among the Jews, as if they had been *Lawyers*, they would have been; more, I am sure, then any other *Lawyers*, which had not been so good *Grammarians*; and yet that any Jewish Lawyer hath avowed the contrary opinion, is not, that I know of, as yet pretended: And 3. For the negligence or oversight of these *Grammarians*, that hath not with any proof or confirmation been laid to their charge, and if it were, 'tis as possible that Jewish Lawyers might have been guilty of it as they, nay it were more reasonable to accuse them of oversight, that make but two, and them of double diligence that have discerned one species more then they. To this Topick of authority I shall add only, that *Aloysius* (whom the Reader is by this Gentleman advised to turn to *Sched. sacro prof. l. 7. c. 10.*) doth affirm in these direct words, *Sunt apud Hebræos plures excommunicationis gradus, Niddui, Cherem, Schematha*; there are several degrees of excommunication among the Hebrews, those three by name, though he in large not to explain the third, as he doth these two former: and so much for the first particular.

Now for the second thing, that these species of excommunication among the Jews were only to exclude from civil society, and

† *Γραμματικῶν*  
*Ἰαμάρων.*  
*Τεχνικῶν,*  
*Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν,*  
*Κερταῶν. Μοσ.*

had nothing to do with sacred, shall venture it to the judgment of intelligent indifferent men, who shall but examine what they meet with on this subject, if it be but at second hand in *Statist. ep. heb.* & Buxtorf, &c. out of the Hebrew writers. It is his observation of p. 55.

*Niddui* the lowest species, that it is *remotio ab aliorum congressu quàm sacro, quàm politico, & domestico*, ad 4 passus, separation not only from civil commerce, but from sacred also. Now that which I conceive hath caused this mistake in this first kind (& from thence perhaps without any new cause extended it to the rest) is that such an one that was separated by *Niddui*, was allowed to come to the sacred meetings, to be present at *Common-prayers*, to teach others, and to be taught with others, as the same author affirms; but then this concludeth not against us, for the same Buxtorf still adds, *sed semper sub dictâ lege remotionis* always under the fore-mentioned law of remotion, and distance. And to these two *and* *dis-* *pari*; it seems are reconcilable thus: *Niddui* is not a total remotion or separation neither from sacred, nor from civil society, (being you know but the first degree or species) but only ad 4 passus, that none can come within the distance of four paces of him that is under the censure; and this degree of separation being extended to sacred as well as civil assemblies, yet excluded him not either from praying with the Congregation, or learning, or (if he were a Doctor) teaching in it; only a mark was set upon him, to discriminate him from others, which were under no censure; this is described in *R. Eliezer*, c. 17. King Solomon, saith he, when he built the house of the Sanctuary, made two gates, one for bridegrooms, another for mourners and excommunicate persons, by which they went into the Temple.

And to these two gates and sorts of men the Apostle may seem to allude *Rom. 12. 15.* & *1 Cor. 7. 30.* when he speaks of weeping with them that weep, & rejoicing with them that rejoice, and no question the *ἄνθρωποι* which we render *bewailing*, *1 Cor. 5. 2.* refers to that stile of mourners, and denotes the solemnity usual among the Jews of putting on mourning habit, and wailing over them that were excommunicate, according to that of the author of the Constitutions under Clement's name, *ἡ ἑκκλησία ὡς ἡ πόλις ἡ ἀνὴρ ὡς ὁ νόστος* & *ἐκκλησία ὡς ἡ πόλις ἡ ἀνὴρ ὡς ὁ νόστος*, 1. 2. Let the incurable be put out of the Church with sorrow and wailing. These mourners, or excommuni-

Self. 58.

cate

cate in that Rabbi were those under *Niddui*, who it seems were admitted to the temple, but appointed to come in at a doore peculiar to them, and with some such mark of discrimination, that they that saw them might pray for them in this form, *Qui inhabitat domum hanc, consoletur te, in datque animo tuo ut obtemperes, &c.* He that dwells in this house, comfort thee, and give thee a heart to obey, by which I am forced to confesse, that *Niddui* did not separate from all society in *sacris*, but only remove to such a distance, and yet the Reader will be forced to confesse also, that this separation or rather remotion belonged ad *sacra*, as well as ad *politica*, and in the same degree that it restrain'd the one kind of society, it restrain'd the other also, and so *Salust. Mar. Dillert. Elector. l. 2. c. 10.* having premised that *Niddui est bominis ab aliorum conventu tam sacro, quam politico, & domestico, ad usque cubitis sue possus per dies 30 remotio, &c.* A remotion from sacred, civil, domestick commerce, to the distance of foure paces for 30 dayes, a deprivation of the marriage bed, of shaving, and washing, and such other commodities, he adds that *TMD* he that is under this censure, may be present at sacred meetings, but so many paces off from the rest of the company.

Sect. 59.

And therefore whereas this author affirmeth that by *Niddui* is not meant an ejection out of the Church, but only a deprivation of that liberty of civil society within four paces, & applies to it that sense, wherein the Poet calls the Britains, tota divisos erbe, divided from the *whole* world, not that they are totally divided from the rest of the world, but to denote a peculiar situation of those Islands in the Ocean, I shal acknowledge the observation so far as it denies a total separation, but not as it intimates a greater separation in *civilibus* then in *sacris*, as the words [peculiari illa civilis inter suos consortii libertatis deprivatione] would seem to import, and as the intention of the writer is by himself demonstrated to be. The matter is sufficiently clear that *Niddui* is but a lighter censure, remotion or restraint for such a degree, but not a total separation either from sacred, or civil society, yet still as much from sacred as from civil, in both limitedly 30 dayes, and for the distance of four Cubits.

Sect. 60.

*Lexicon Rab.*  
p. 827.

But then for *Cherem* the second degree, that is defin'd by *Buxtorf*, exclusion from the sacred assemblies, casting out of the Syna-

logue

gogue with all the curse of Deut. 28. (to which, say<sup>r</sup> others, was added the Ceremony of putting out the Candles, to signify him deprived of the light of heaven) and he hath proof for it out of Maimonides in *Madda*, c. 7. *Muchram non docet neque discit cum aliis*. He that is under the second censure, is excluded from bearing the law in publick; And, as <sup>r</sup> Buxtorf<sup>r</sup> elsewhere adds, *δ Synagoga, conventibus, negotiis, publicis, sacris, & politicis omnibus exclusus, donec resipiscat*; which may further appear by the form of this anathema, which he brings out of an *antient Hebr. manuscript*. *Sit in anathemate sanctorum excelsum, in anathemate, Seraphim, & Ophurim, in anathemate totius Ecclesie*, &c. Now from this, the third species differs onely in this, that as that was a total separation, *donec resipiscat, ut* he repent, but reversible upon repentance, total for the present, but not irremissible, so this was both total and final too, & so undoubtedly (not remitting of the severity of the second but adding to it) extended to the separation in *sacris* also; and therefore whatsoever may be said of *Schammatha* in the wide Rabbinical acception of it, as it goes indifferently for *Niddah*, there will be little doubt, but the *Schammatha* peculiarly so called, or that which is call'd *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ* & *יְהוָה יְהוּדָה*, the *Schammatha* of the Lord, or of the God of Israel, is; as the learned define it, *Ea quæ quis totaliter & finaliter ab Ecclesia* (as that notes *sacrum sacrum*, as well as *civilem*) *segregatus, divino iudicio sit devotus, & cum eâ mors & exitium*; so Dilherr. l. 2. of *Maranatha* (which he supposes to be al one with it) *Est proscriptio extrema, & absque spe veniæ irrogata, quæ reus omnibus humane societatis iuribus, legibus, & officiis exclusus, iudicio divino committitur, & ad extremam desolationem condemnatur*. A perfect proscription, without hope of pardon, by which the offender is excluded from all privileges, and offices of humane society, and committed to the judgement of God, and condemned to extremum desolation. I shal abstain from adding more to the proof of this truth in the several species, conceiving that I have sufficiently proved or vindicated in the lowest; & shewed the *causam & occasionem*, the cause or the occasion of their mistake, who deny it; and then there will be little need to confirm it any further in the other two degrees, which do add to that lowest; but cannot be thought to come short of it.

And having thus clear'd the first thing which we proposed, Sect. 61.

view'd

<sup>r</sup> Dilherr. elect. l. 2.

<sup>r</sup> Ep. Hebr. 29. fol. p. 56.

view'd the several sorts of *Excommunication* among the Jews, I proceed now to the second, to those places of the New Testament which seem to refer to them: In which matter I shall not be confident or dogmatical, but deliver my thoughts as for the present it seems to me, & shew you the grounds of my so seeming. And 1. that place *Luk. 6. 22.* doth appear to belong to *Excommunication* among the Jews, but whether to one only or more species of it, I am uncertain: *ἀποεἶλον* surely belongs to the first kind, that of *Niddui*, which cannot be more literally rendered in Greek then by *ἀποεἶλον*, separation, or remotion, 4 paces off, and perhaps that with *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* added to it, signifies to do it *contumeliously*. But yet because 'tis possible, that *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* may have a greater force in it, and be a notation of *curfing* and *execration*, not only in this but in other places of the Gospel, therefore I conceive that word (set immediately after *ἀποεἶλον*) may denote the second degree, that of *Cherem*, & then to the same will belong that third phrase also of *ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν* to cast out your name as evil, for an *Hebraism* there is in these words, which though a very learned man conceive to consist in this; 1. that *ἐκβάλλειν* shall be all one with *ἐκρίβην* as indeed sometimes it is) 2. that as *ἐκρίβην ὄνομα πονηρὸν* is to bring up an evil report, so *ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα πονηρὸν* shall signify the same thing; yet I shall take leave to interpose, 1. that the phrase used for bringing up an evil report, *ἤγειρεν ῥήματα πονηρὰ πρὸς τὸν* not *ὄνομα*, but *ῥήματα*, nor *ῥήματα τῶν*, but *πρὸς τὸν*, and in brief, that I cannot find any where *ἐκρίβην* οἱ *ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα πονηρὸν* in the translators of the old, or writers of the new Testament, for bringing up an evil report. 2. That *ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν*, to cast out your name as evil; 1. [*ὑμῶν* yours] then [*ὡς* as] added, will be somewhat another kind of phrase then *ἐκβάλλειν οἱ ἐκρίβην ὄνομα πονηρὸν* [to bring up an evil name or report] is in our language a very intelligible phrase for *defaming*, but [to bring up your name or report as evil] is not so; and therefore I shall venture to propose my conjecture, that the *Hebraism* is not in the word [*ἐκβάλλειν*] but in the [*ὄνομα*] & [*πληρὸν*]; so that 1. *ὄνομα ὑμῶν* shall signify no more then your persons, or you (as *Mat. 1. 23.* [*καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ*] is no more then he, as *ῥήματα*, *Ἀβ. 1. 15.* signifies persons of men) shall be (not he shall be named by that name) a God with



with us, or God incarnate) and then *as words* shall signifie [as scandalous] or offensive, or abominable, as *words* is by the 72. sometimes rendered *abominable* being ashamed (whence perhaps our English *bashful* and *abash*) sometimes *abominable*, to abominate, sometimes *wicked*, *impious* to be evil or wicked, Gen. 34. 24. Esd. 4. 12. and so [to cast out your names as evil] will clearly signifie to cast you out as wicked, shameful, abominable persons, a denotation of the *excommunication* which was not onely separating or removing to a distance, but *totally casting out*, and that with reproaches, curses, and execrations, such as in *Moses* are denounced against greater malefactors; whether these circumstances of this text do thus denote, I am not confident, and therefore have onely proposed a conjecture, but that the *excommunication*, and *excommunication* do referre to the *Niddui* and *Cherem* I doubt not, nor if you marke it, doth *H. Grotius* who hath enlarged on that subject of Excommunication, in his *Annotations* on that verse.

No more do I find my self moved by the arguments of that learned Gentleman to doubt, but that *excommunication* is to be turned out of the Synagogue, Joh. 9. 22. 12. 42. 16. 2. refers to the second of these species among the Jews, for that *synagogue* and *synagoga* do sometime signifie a civil Congregation or assembly, and not alwayes a sacred (as when the hypocrite is said to pray standing, *in synagoga* in places of publick concourse and corners of the streets, as the most visible places, *Matth. 6.*) I shall easily grant, & yet not think my self thereby concluded, or obliged to yeeld, but that it may also, at other times, note the holy assembly, or meeting for the performance of sacred duties, out of which it was sure no news for the Jews (after that capital judgements were taken away from them) to eject notorious malefactors, particularly hereticks, false prophets, or their sectators, and disciples, as these here for preaching of Christ, whom the Jews acknowledged not, in like manner as in the time of the Captivity, Esd. 10. 8. the order is given, that whosoever appears not upon summons *shall be* (forfeited we render, the word is *excommunicated*) noting the *Cherem* which we now speak of) devoted, and stigmatized as an evidence of that kinde of Excommunication which follows in the

Sect. 62.

the next words, *quod si separatus in excommunicatione*, be shall be separated from the Church or Congregation of the captivity, not only from Civil, but Ecclesiastical Society with them, for Cherem was formerly demonstrated to signify nay, it may with some reason be conceived in that place from Ecclesiastical only, in case of Cherem or total ejection; for 'tis more probable, that the King under whom they were captive, allowing them some liberty for the exercise of their religion, but in civil matters keeping them as captives and servants, should permit them to punish one another by that way of casting out of their Ecclesiastical Assemblies, then by that other of civil interdict, especially if it be conceiv'd to extend to banishment, &c. which would intrench upon his Prerogative, and be a kind of turning the captive out of his captivity.

Sett. 63.

Instit. Ep. He.  
p. 56.

In Exc. Gem.  
Sanhedr. c. I.  
p. 149.

That *amora yis* belongs to this second species, and so to casting out of the society in *sacris*, is the distinct affirmation of the learned Doctor in these words, *Hæc est illa excommunicatio* (speaking of Cherem) *de qua in Evangelio Johannis*, cap. 9. 22. 12. 42. *est ab eo tempore Rabbini quodam ipsi adhererint* and the intimation of \* John Coth also in these words, *Qui simpliciter excommunicatur est*, *quod est ille quidem separatus a ceteris ita ut pro vera membro Ecclesie non habeatur, non tamen videtur esse* *amora yis* *quia doctrinae particeps est*. From which words of that very learned man, I observe these two things contrary to what I set lately affirm'd: That *amora yis* doth not belong to *Niddah*; but to Cherem. 12. That it is an ejection not only ab Ecclesia, Synagoga, as that notes *republicam Judæorum*, but from sacred Assemblies, noted by *doctrinae particeps*, according to that rule in *Maimonides*. *Deotus nec docet nec docetur*, such an one is excluded from both, it seems, and so from those holy Assemblies, where that was wont to be done.

Sett. 64.

To this phrase of [*amora yis* *whomsoever*] is subjoyn'd *Jo. 16. 2. and whosoever he saith*, &c. but (or ye) *he how cometh that every man that killeth you shall seem, or be thought to do God service, or to offer a sacrifice to him*, wherton I shall interpose a conjecture, that those words may possibly denote the third degree, that of *Schammitta*, at least a consequent of it, for so saith \* Doctor

Ep. Heb. instit.  
p. 58.

of

of that species, *Mortem dicit, quia cuiusvis manus eius vita exposita est, et cuilibet eum interficiendi libera potestas* : It is so call'd, because such a mans life is exposed to any ones hands, every one having a free power of killing him : & so to that he applies the *Marranba* which is added to *Anathema*, 1 Cor. 16. 22. a forme of extreme proscription, delivering up the sinner to divine revenge, in which case whosoever kill'd him, conceived himself to perform an act of execution of justice, and service to God.

Some other places there are in the *New Testament* belonging to these *Judaical censures*, fit to be explained, but I have chosen to insist onely on those because, I lately find them otherwise rendred, but yet discern no reason to recede from what I have now delivered, that they do belong to those species of *Excommunication* not only from civil but from sacred assemblies, though one in an higher degree then another. To which I shall onely adde, that they which have applied these places to *Christian excommunication*, any otherwise then only by way of accommodation, shall not be pleaded for by me, who acknowledge that they belong to the *Jews*, and to their usage of *Christians*, and not to some *Christians* dealing with others; but then sure there is as little reason on their side who will not allow that way of accommodation, which would not be at all unreasonable, though those phrases among the *Jews* were supposed to belong only to civil commerce; It being ordinary for *Christ* to ordain some things in his Church, which were answerable to civil not sacred customes among the *Jews* (as the *Lords Supper*, sure an Ecclesiastical rite among us, was to their *pass-cenium*, which was not so, and many the like,) to transplant from their forum to our Church, and therefore no way unfit for the *Apostles* and following Church to appropriate those words to Ecclesiastical senses, though they were supposed to be among the *Jews* of a greater latitude : Of which sort, because I formerly promised it, I shall now specify in some instances.

Sect. 65.

This may be discern'd in the word *anathema*, which if

Sect. 66.

any man should prove to have no other sense among *Christians*, then that of a meeting together in a *Town hall*, upon no other way of probation, but that the *Hebrew* words answerable to that, are by the *Talmudists*, yea even in the *Scripture* of the *Old Testament* taken in this sense, this would be a little strange; the matter of fact being most evident to the contrary, and it being most prompt and proper, that words used either among the *Greeks* or *Hebrews* in *forinſeal* senses, may be bent by *Christian Writers* to a *sacred*.

Señ.67.

So in like manner, the word Ἀπόστολοι, it is acknowledged, is answerable to the **אפוסטל** among the *Jewes*, and that word denoted among them some *offices*, which if they may in any respect be counted *Ecclesiastical*, are yet very distant from the *Christian* use of it: such was that of the *Messengers* sent out to demand and bring in the dues to the *Temple*, which cannot without the helpe of *accommodation* be applyed to the *Christian* acceptation of the word; and such againe was the *proxy* in contracting or marrying two persons, for he was call'd **אפוסטל** i. e. *Apostolus* alio, an *intercessor* or *intermance* betwixt them, which as a *sponsor*, undertook for one to the other, the *νυμφαγωγός*, such as *Samson* had *Judg.* 14. 20. i. e. in *Varinus* his definition ὁ μετὰ χείρῳ τοῦ ἑτέρου νύμφου, ἢ ἄγων αὐτῷ τὴν παρθένον; *δικίμης*, of whom he saith that

<sup>ο</sup>Μάρισα τὴν  
χρὶ δ' αἰτερεν  
γάμον, καθ' ὃν  
εἰς θύμης τ' νυμ-  
φίον μετ' ἵεναι,  
ἀλλ' ὑποσέλ-  
λας φίλον,  
Phavor.

Ρ<sup>ν</sup> Ονομ. 3.ε.  
 πει μνησας

when the Bridegroom himself must not go into the Father's house, (viz. in a second marriage, such as that was of God with the Gentiles, who had before espoused the Jews) ἀποσταλὸν ἑκ ἑλῶν τινος, he sends one of his friends: To which mention of the word (according to one punctuation of the place) the Apostle may seem to referre, 2 Cor. 11. 2. when he expresses his Apostleship by ἀνυστάμενος ὑμᾶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ, I have espoused you to one husband, according to that sense of ἀρμολῶ acknowledged by P. Julius Pollux, ὁ συνδεὶς ἐγγυὸς ἀρμολῶν, ὅθεν τινος ἑκ πολλῶν ἀρμολῶν ὁ μνηστὴρ ἐκδιδάσκει making the μνηστὴρ, or sponsor all one with ἀρμολῶν, and ἐγγυὸν to signify the interceding or mediating a marriage, all one with that word ἀρμολῶν there used by St. Paul, agreeable to which

the world appears is by *Pollux* further extended to the mediators of any kinde of league, *infirmities*, and then according to this notion also, is the *Apostles* pacifick office, praying and beseeching in *Christs* stead to be reconciled to God, all which are very convenient accommodations, but farre from requiring the *Christian* words of the very kinde of sense that the *Hebrew* did import.

So againe, *Bishops* in the *Christian Church*, doe in respect of their office, particularly that of imposition of bands, (peculiar to them above the *Presbyters* even in *St. Jeromes* confession) referre to the *NW*, the *Principes Synedrui*, who imposed hands upon those that were elected into the *Sanbedrim*, but in respect of the name they referre to the use of the word *TPAD* among the *Jewes*, and accordingly the very word *Bishops* is both *1 Mac. 1. 53.* and in *Josephus*, set to signifie them that are set over any publicke businesse, the *epistates* that set men a worke, and require an account of the performance, and yet are by way of accommodation brought both in the *New Testament*, and in all *Sacred Writers* since, to signifie an office parallel to this, but purely *Ecclesiastick*.

So the word *episcopos*, though in the *Old Testament* it belong properly to the *Elders* of the people either in a common notion, or as members of their *Sanbedrim*, not any body, or single persons peculiarly *Ecclesiastick*, (though by the way tis most cleare, that the *high Priests* were not onely of this number, part of their *Sanbedrim*, nor *synedrui* or *episcopos*, but also the chiefs of them, and therefore in the *New Testament* the mention of the *high Priests* and *Elders* comes oft together in point of iudicature; and the businesse of that Court, being all kinde of affaires, *Civil* as well as *Ecclesiastick*, it was most reasonable that some persons of both conditions should be intrusted with them, and there being so, no wonder that there was no other Court, or *Tribunal* meerly *Ecclesiastick*) yet doth it unquestionably belong, both in

Sec. 68.

Sec. 69.

many



many places of the New Testament, and in the constant acception of primitive and antient writers, to an order of Ecclesiasticks, as is most apparent both by Clemens, and Ignatius, and is confirm'd by them, which assert the jurisdiction of Bishops, and Presbyters: which makes it not very reasonable to consent to the way of arguing, twice used by that learned Writer, who from the Talmudical writings of the Creation of the Jewish Elders, would conclude how little, or how nothing there is in the Creation of a Presbyter among Christians, more then of a Doctor of Law, &c. But this by the way.

Sett. 70.

Lastly, to the *Antient Dedone* in the Christian Church are directly parallel to the *Qaddish* under the Synagogue, called by Epiphanius (by a light inflexion or change of the Hebrew) *Alazirah*, the *Thazophanis* or treasurers, *tas Siamonide* *Xelis* *Antiquari* in Philo, *Xelazirah* *Antiquari* in Josephus; which I wonder a learned man should carpe at, only upon this exception, because it was not proved they were in *synagoga presbiteri*, ut ministrarent mensis, when 'tis clear that the *Siamonide* *Antiquari* in the Acts, noting first the ministering to them in the *Qaddish*, that common table for the poore and rich, doth in universum significat [providing for the poore] and that is as clearly parallel to the office of those treasurers among the Jewes, as if they had literally in the Synagogue served tables.

\*Rivet. Grot.  
disc. Synag. pag.  
475.

Sett. 71.

I should now proceed to my third proposal, the phrases which are purely Christian, but that I conceive it not unfit to take notice of one difficulty (which we have not yet mentioned, nor shall have occasion to mention among the phrases purely Christian) and to give some account of that in this place. And it is, to examine what was the condition, 1. Of Heathens. 2. Of Samaritans. 3. Of those that are called Sinners. 4. Of Publicans among the Jewes, being tempted to that (if it be an extravagance) by another Parenthesis in a learned Authour before mentioned.

Sect. 72.

For Gentiles, they were of three sorts; either 1. Proselytes of justice, who were circumcised, and undertook their whole law, and these were allowed to live among them, to enjoy all liberty and privileges, that any Jew did, differing from them in nothing but their Gentile-birth. Secondly, Proselytes of the Gates, which were converted so far by them, as to receive the precepts of the law of Adam and Noah, but not to be circumcised, &c. and these were also permitted to live freely among them in civil society, and to come to the temple (God's house being a house of prayer to all people, i.e. to all such Gentile worshippers, or godly men of the nation) but that with a mark of difference from the Jewes, and perfect Proselytes, there being a court provided on purpose for them, called the court of the Gentiles, divided from the court of the Jewes by a little partition called by the Apostle *χωριον* or *χωρηιον*, by *Josephus* *χωρηιον* or *χωρηιον*, on which was written *χωρηιον* *χωρηιον* *χωρηιον*, that no such Gentile proselyte might go in, i.e. beyond their owne, into the Jewes court; and to these though admitted to society in *factis*, yet were to removed or separated by law, the whole body of them, that they were in a manner under the censure of *excommunication*, or *anathema*, separated from them for some small space, proportionable to that of four paces, but this not by any act of excommunication, but by a general law or tradition, thus discriminating them from Jewes in this particular.

Sect. 73.

Thirdly, there were the Gentiles continuing still utterly unconverted in their Gentilisme, and with these they were not to have society at all (not only in *factis*, for there was no need of insisting that, they would not joyn with them, and for them to joyn in the Gentile sacrifices were down-right idolatry) but to sever from them, for feare their company and conversation should infuse their Gentiles finnes into them, wherein they were so stiff, that they would not goe into the platform, where the band of *Roman* (i.e. such Gentile) soldiers were

Job.

Job. 18. ver. 28. counting it a Pollution, if they had so done. So you see what was the condition of the Gentiles among the Jewes, and all this by Law or standing custome among them, without any interposition of any degree of excommunication, as having nothing to do to judge them which are without, i.e. the last kind of Gentiles, and having set rules for the other two.

Señ. 74.

Then for the Samaritans, they are almost, if not quite, in the same case with the last sort of Gentiles, no conversation allowed between the Jewes and them, as you see Job. 4. ver. 9. *et cetera* *et cetera* *et cetera*, the Jewes have not common commerce with the Samaritans, no not so farre, as that one should give the other meat or drinke in his want, or helpe him to it, as appears by the former part of that verse. Does thou being a Jewe, to drinke of me being a Samaritan? they might not wash, eat together, which was proportionable to the *Niddah*, (that being a separation, to the distance of foure paces, of eate and drinking together promiscuously) and not only so, but an interdicting of acts of common humanity, as helping to necessities of life, like the proscription among the Romans; but this is not by way of excommunication againe, (but by standing law or custome) for the Samaritans used not the same place of worship with the Jewes, came not to Jerusalem, Job. 4. ver. 20. and so could not be excommunicated by them. Nay, Matth. 10. ver. 5. you shall see the Samaritan and the Gentiles joyned together in opposition to the Jewes, when the Apostles are commanded to go neither to the way of the Gentiles, nor to the City of Samaria, but onely to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; that is, first to them, before either Samaritan or Gentiles were preacht to, which were all one in effect, the Samaritan being called *Alien*, an alien; Luke 17. 16.

Buxt. Ep. Heb.  
infir. p. 55.

In the next place, the word *sinners* is in the New Testament an equivocal word; for it may signifie either Gentiles, as Gal. 2. 15. *sinners* of the Gentiles, or else scandalous offenders,

in-

infamous persons, *barlats*, &c. these (it seems) it was unlawful to eat with, *Mat. 9. 11*. If taken under the first notion, the case will be clear upon the same account, as before we gave you of the *Heathens*: but under the second notion, it implies signify notorious offenders, then are they considered either as men under the punishment of *excommunication*, or at least worthy to be under it, and that either under *niddui* or *cherem*, the lowest of which would make them incapable of familiar conversation, and eating together with other Jews; and upon that ground, the *Jews* might quarrel with *Christ* for eating with them, and *S. Paul* speaking of the incestuous person might refer to the Jewish custome, and thereupon command *οὐ τροφίμους εὐνοίας*, not to eat with him, (that remotion in *niddui* for the distance of four cubits, being unreconcilable with familiar eating together) and so the *Pharisee*, when the *Savvy* *ἀνθρώπου*, *Luk. 7. 37*. came with her cruse of ointment, and anointed and kist *Christ's* feet, resolves that if *Christ* knew what she were, he would not admit of so near a commerce with her; and concludes him no *Prophet*, that he did not know it.

Lastly, for the *Publicans*, who were also thought unfit for men to eat and drink with, I conceive that is not again from any of the *Jewish* censures past upon them, but only because either they were *Gentiles*, and so incapable of that commerce, or else being *Jews*, yet being officers of the *Romans*, they were supposed to commerce ordinarily with *Gentiles*, and so to be polluted by that means, and by the law of legal pollution interdicted that familiar reception among the *Jews*, notwithstanding which, it appears, the *Publican*, *Luk. 18. 10*, went up to the Temple to pray, as well as the *Pharisee*; and if the Parable be argumentative, it seems the *Pharisee* and the *Publican* were in the same Court of the Temple, (as may be guessed by the *Pharisees* pointing him out, *This Publican*) and so that the *Publican* enjoyed all the same priviledges of access that the other did, (though still he continued afar off, & that in a most humble posture, as if he were under *niddui*, that lowest degree of *excommunication*) but because it may be subject to mistake, to argue from *Parables*, I shall not do so, but leave the

Secl. 76.

Publican joyned with the sinner, as one Heathen with another, both by the Jewish laws, forbidden to converse with, and not expelled by any censure of excommunication.

These conjectures being thus obiter and in passage premised, only on purpose to discard some lesse pertinent places, which some others perhaps have taken liberty to make use of, and not out of design to make any special advantage of this explication of them, in order to my present purpose, or in opposition to any; I come now to the last thing proposed even now, to shew you the phrases more purely Christian: Such are, 1. To deliver unto Satan, *παράδοτε τὸν Σατανᾷ*, 1 Cor. 5. 5. 1 Tim. 1. 20. answerable to Cberem among the Jews, so far as belonged to the society in sacris, a turning the blasphemers out of the Church of Christ: This was the frequent stile of excommunication, because it was the depriving the man of those every-day means which are in Christianity afforded, as ordinarily usefull to eject Satan and the power of his Kingdom out of the heart: Such are, 1. The Prayers of the Church. 2. The publick use of the Word or Doctrine of Christianity: (for so he that is under Cberem, *neq; docet neq; docetur*, neither teacheth nor are taught, and in the ancient Christian Church it appears they were excluded from that, & upon repentance received for the first three years among the *αὐτοψήφους*, or hearers in the porch, *δύσιν ἀπὸ γέφυρῃ*, saith Zonaras, which being the first degree of their return to communion, argues that before they were excluded from it) and thirdly, the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, in which respect scandalous sinners are by S. Jude call'd *spots in their feasts*, or *αἵμας* (which being annexed to the Lords Supper denoted the whole action) i. e. unfit, as blemished sacrifices to be received there. The use of which means being in the economy of the Gospel designed to so much advantage to the Soule, for the casting Satan out of it, consequently the banishing from, or depriving of the use of those means is properly stiled the delivering to Satan, though in Gods gracious disposal of all things, that be designed by him also to the same gracious end, to cast Satan out of him, on whom nothing else can be ab'e to work.

SECT. 77.

But then secondly, it was so call'd, because in the Apostles times a sad consequent there was of this tradition or excommunication,



nication, proportionable to the dirt or execrations in the Jewish ceremony, which, say they, *rare effectuerebant, seldom wanted the effect*, to wit, corporal power and possession, and inflictions of Satan on those, who were delivered up to him, as to a *licitor* or *caruifex* (in like manner as we read befell Saul after his defection from God, when the evil spirit came upon him, 1 Sam. 16. vers. 14.)

For it must be remembred, that about Christ's time, and a little after, the devil was permitted to have such a ranging unlimited power, that he did ordinarily obtain leave to tyrannize over the bodies of mortal men, laying all kinds of diseases upon them, (as indeed there is scarce any kind of disease, but some resemblance of it you may finde in some or other of those described in the Gospel) which is sometimes called *μαρτύριον*, *Satans buffetting*, 2 Cor. 12. 7. sometimes *βασανίζω*, *racking or tormenting*, as of the Paralytick, Mat. 8. 6. grievously tormented, and so Mat. 4. v. 24. that condition of men is described by *παύλαις νόσοις* & *βασανισμοῖς* *ἐν δαίμονι* & *δαίμονι*: we render it, *taken with divers diseases and torments*, the word *ἐν δαίμονι* (as *ἐν νόσῳ*) is used ordinarily for those, that are possess'd with devils, and so here of those consequents of such possessions, and therefore follows, *ἐν δαίμονι*, and possess'd with devils. And sometimes *δέσμις*, to bind, as Luk. 11. 13. in the story of the woman which had the spirit of infirmity, vers. 11. (i.e. a devil or evil spirit that inflicted a strange infirmity or disease upon her) 18. years, *binding her together*, that she was not able to look up. 'Tis said of her, *ὅτι ὁ σατάν* & *Σατανάς*, that Satan had bound her, ver. 16. and the curing her is call'd loosing her from her infirmity, ver. 12. *ἀπὸ δεσμῶν*, from her bond, ver. 16. agreeable to the phrase of binding and loosing in this business, Mat. 16. 19. & 18. 10. Hence it is that the Apostles delivering to Satan, is said to be *ἡ ἀνάδοξις τοῦ σώματος*, 1 Cor. 5. 5. to the destruction of the flesh, i.e. by way of pain or disease, a special part of Apostolical discipline. Thus in Ignatius Epistle to the Romans, we have *ὁ βλάστης τοῦ σατάν*, the punishment of the devil, which I conceive in that place must belong onely to temporal inflictions; because he wishes it were upon himself; *ὅπως ἴδωμαι ἡνίκά μου ἔσται ἡ ἀνάδοξις*, that he may by that means obtain for virtue to Christ, of which eternal would deprive him; and, pethaps S. Paul's wish extended no farther, Rom. 9. then to be thus

Sect. 78.

excommunicate from the Church of Christ, and to be under those temporal evils that attended it, which was an enlargement of love also to his brethren.

Sect. 79.

The summe of what hath been spoken on this point, is, That as amongst the ancient heathen Romans there was banishment, and *interdictio ignis & aque*, offenders were interdicted the necessities of life: and as in *Iosephus*, the *Esseni* *τοῖς ἐξουσιάζουσιν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῷ τῆς γῆς & ἐν τῆς ἀντιθέσεως διαιτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ διαβολῆς, ἀποκαταστήσει τὸν κόσμον, &c.* cast out from their congregation such as are taken in notorious offences, and they that are thus cast out, come many times to miserable deaths, consumed with hunger, &c. or as *Heliodorus*, 2 *Mac.* 3. in his sacrilegious enterprise was scourged by two Angels in the shape of young men, v. 26. and hardly came off with life. So the Apostolical Excommunication, or *Anathema*, was attended with these adversaries of life, diseases, pains, & grievous torments, to lay a necessity on them of returning, or being reformed by that means. And this I conceive is the rod which the Apostle mentions, 1 *Cor.* 4. 21. the power of inflicting death, as on *Ananias*, or diseases, blindness on *Elymas*, and the like; the Heb: *נִסָּה* there rendered *passus*, rod, being *Isa.* 10. 24. *נִסָּה*, a plague, all one with *מַסָּה*, *Mar.* 3. 10. and so very capable in that place of this interpretation, & by the matter of the choice there proposed to the *Corinthians* most fitly applied to it.

Sect. 80.

This have I said, (and might adde a great deal more) to illustrate this one phrase of *delivering to Satan*, and in it that Apostolical censure of excommunication, and its attendant, corporal inflictions of diseases and pains.

Sect. 81.

To all which, methinks *Cains* condition described, *Gen.* 4. is very applyable, (by way of accommodation at least) ver. 14. Behold, thou hast driven me out from the face of the earth; answerable to v. 11. Thou art cursed from the earth, the or *Anathema* to which the cursing there is answerable, being a species of excommunication higher then *Niddui* or *ἀποκρίσις*, even a driving or casting out, the English of *ἐκδιώξαι* before mentioned, *Luk.* 6. 22. i.e. either from the Church (as anon you shall see *γὰρ* signifie) or which is all one, from that part of the earth, where *Adam* and his other children dwelt, as the sole Church then existent, and there.

thereupon immediately it follows, and from thy face *shal I be hid*: Gods face typically noting the Church, where God had alwayes a peculiar presence, to which refers the *bread of faces*, or *showbread* in the Temple, shewing or signifying the presence of God there; and I *shal be a fugitive and a vagabond*; and then finally it *shal come to passe*, saith he, *that every one that findeth me, shall slay me*; there is the *death*, or *murder*, *excision*, from which though God freed him, v. 15. yet the other he lay under, as appears by v. 16. *Cain went out from the presence of the Lord*, went out, i.e. was turned out (as *ἀπαρσεν*, Mat. 25. 40. is all one with *ἐκβαλεν*, chap. 8. 12.) of the presence of the Lord, i.e. out of the Church, or visible congregation of Gods servants, the place where God is pleased peculiarly to exhibite himself, i.e. out of Adams family or the place where he dwelt, for it follows, *Cain dwelt in the land of Nod on the East of Eden*, but this only as an image or accommodation.

One thing I desire here to interpose as in a Parenthesis, Sect. 82. which hath been touched on in other\* Papers, but will be here seasonably set down more at large, as peculiarly pertine[n]t to the matter now in hand of delivering to Satan; and 'tis this, that this act of the Church in delivering up to Satan, is but an image of Gods real dealing, who is wont upon occasion tradere Satanae, to deliver men unto Satan. The ground of this affirmation you may discern by compounding these Scripture Truths together. 1. That Satan is our adversary before God, and therefore call'd Satan *ἄντι* which signifies so, and also *ἐχθρός* enemy, and *ἀντιπάλος* set against us, &c. Secondly, that one main act of his Satanship is exprest in accusing us before God, Rev. 12. 10. and thence he is call'd peculiarly *ἀντίδικος*, i.e. an opposite, *ἀντί*, in court of judicature, 1 Pet. 5. 8. and that either 1. upon some false suggestion, no real crime, as particularly that of unsincerity (or serving God only as long as God used him wel, allowed him the *ἐννυχία* *πράξις*) in the case of Job. Chap. 1. vers. 9. 11. in which respect he is peculiarly call'd *καταλαλῶν* a calumniator; and 'tis observable that the 72. doe most what render *ἄντι* by that word, noting this act of calumny: i.e. Gods servants to their Master, to be a special piece of his being our adversary; Or else, secondly, upon the real commission of some sin, which advantage he will be sure not to omit, when he

can take it, for sure he that will accuse falsely, will not spare to accuse when he hath true matter of accusation allowed him. To which purpose he is styled *observator calancæ*, an observer of the beel, in the vulgar Latine, Gen. 3. 15. (agreeable to the Septuagint *τηνός τις ὁπρὲς*, unless (which I easily believe) that be a fals print for *τηνός*) an observer of the beel of Christ, i. e. of Christians; or one that goeth up and down, to and fro in the earth, Job 1. 7. to finde out matter of accusation, and in this sense he is called *κατάγορος ἢ ἀδισαφὴς*, i. e. an accuser (as that differs critically from a *διδόσα* or calumniator) of the brethren, i. e. Christians, or believers, when they fall into a fault. An example of this, I conceive, we have in the case of S. Peter, Luk. 22. 31. where *Satan* desiring to have Peter, seems to be founded upon some previous or precedent accusation of him for some criminal commission, perhaps that of striving with the other Disciples for superiority, immediately preceding v. 24. (as his successor at Rome hath done ever since) or for some other sin, which Satan saw, though we do not at this distance,

Sect. 83.

And upon this putting in of accusations against any, follows in the third place, his *expetitivæ tribraret*, Luk. 22. 31. his desiring to winnow his solema<sup>r</sup> petition to God that he that hath so offended, may be delivered unto him; parallel to which our English Bibles make that other place *ζητῶν τὴν καταστροφὴν*, seeking whom he may devour, 1 Pet. 5. 8. which is there plainly attributed to him, as he is *ἀντίδικος*, a plaintiff or adversary in a Court, implaining, or accusing, or delivering to the Judge, Matt. 5. 25. that so he may deliver him back again as to a tormentor; and then if this Satanical course or *μωδὸς* prevails, if this accusation be received, this petition be granted, as it was (though with limitation) Job 1. 12. the result is, a man delivered up to Satan, to have as Job had, so many assayes of his malice practised upon him. To which purpose you may please to observe what *Isidorus* hath given us in his *Scholia* on the *Chaldean Oracles* on that text [ *πῶς αὖ μὲν τῶν ἀρχαίων*, the devils have the power of binding men ]

Reg. 93.

*Ἄς πῶς αὖ τοις ἀτιμωμένοις, καὶ βάσανος ἢ ἐνδεσμοῖς ὑποκινῶν ἐν δισμῶσι ταῦτα, καὶ ἀπὸ ἀπύχου, καὶ μόνον τοῖς ἡμῶν πᾶσις ἀνέκοιται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἡμῶν ὅσοις ἐνδεσμοῖς. These punitive envious devils do bind, and even strangle the soules of good and (as we say) regenerate men; and from thence it follows, saith he,*  
that





the woman with the spirit of infirmity, and she was delivered, to be loosed from her bond, to expresse the cure of that disease. So *Jam. 5. 13.* (which if it strictly belong not, may yet commodiously be applied to this matter) you find together the (*οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδυναμία*) saving or recovering the sick, & (*καὶ ἡ ἀπολύσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*) remission of his sins also : yea and it is observable what *St. Cyprian* saith so many yeares after, that baptism the seale of pardon of sin, freed those from evil spirits, that were before troubled with them ; (Whence sure it was, that the Catechists that prepared Converts for baptism, are in the Canons of the Councils call'd *ἐξορκιστῆς*, Exorcists) and if after baptism they relapsed to sinning, the evil spirit returned again ; by which 'tis manifest, saith he, that the Devil in baptism is turn'd out by the faith of the believer, and his faith failing, returns again.

Sect. 85.

I shall only adde two things to this matter, 1. That this may possibly be the original and occasion, if not the prime importance of that phrase, *1. Job. 5. 16.* [*ἐμψύχῳ τῷ θανάτῳ*] a sin unto death, (in which the faithful are not bound to pray for him that is guilty of it, or in which case there is no promise that their prayers shall be heard) i. e. a sin of such a nature, as to which the delivering up to Satan the power the *ἐκδοτικὸν* belongs, the committer of which (though he might in general be pray'd for, yet) as long as he continued impenitent & obdurate he was deprived of the prayers of the Church, at least was fit to be excluded out of the Church, where men prayed in common one for another, as many as were present ; nay perhaps the Apostles, having the power of discerning of spirits, might possibly discern some man impenetrably obstinate, and so irrecoverably gone, and so give over all praying or interceding for him, (as on the other side [*ἐὰν τις ἴδῃ*] if any man without that spirit of discerning, see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask or pray, &c. nay on the contrary pray for his excision in some cases, as the after-Church judging, though with an humane (and so possibly fallible) judgment, of *Julian the Apostate*, banisht him out of their prayers, (and rather prayed for his cutting off) to which yet I make no doubt they would have given him a return, if they should have discerned any probability of his return unto the faith.

The

The second thing which I shal add hereby way of appendage, is, that from hence will appear, the meaning of *ἡ ἀποκρίσις* *mar-natha*, 1 Cor. 16. 22. which is as if it were *ἡ ἀποκρίσις* and *ἡ ἀποκρίσις* (the second, and *ἡ ἀποκρίσις* (the Lord comes) the third sort of the Jewish censures) compacted or put together into one, perhaps not to signifie in that place any peculiar kinde of censure among Christians instituted (as some would think) in these words against those that have committed the *sin against the Holy Ghost*. For the [*ἡ ἀποκρίσις*, loveth not] there, will not properly signifie that *sin*, nor indeed any other, of which the Church can have cognizance, (loving, or not loving being a secret of the heart, till it break out into some actual virtue or sin, & then it puts off that title of the affection, and is call'd by the name of the action) but by way of accommodation, to apply to the state of such a man the two last degrees of excommunication among the Jews, the one noting total, the other final, irreverfible excoition; and by that terrible representation, as by a clap and a flash of thunder and lightning together, to give a through sense of the danger of that state to let an amazing formidable mark or character upon those that love not the Lord Jesus: whether they be hypocrites, who whatsoever ell they are, are certainly no lovers of Christ, at least not lovers *ἡ ἀποκρίσις*, in sincerity, Ep. 6. 24. or whether haters of him, as al vicious persons are, and then the [*ἡ ἀποκρίσις*, let him be] is not alwayes a legal form of censure, but either a Prophetick or Apostolical denunciation, importing but this, that the hypocrite or hater of Jesus Christ shall undoubtedly be damned.

By that which hath been said on occasion of this first phrase Sect. 87. (of delivering to Satan) wil appear distinctly, wherein this power of binding in the first branch of it, as peculiar to the Apostles from after ages, consists, peculiarly in the power of delivering up to corporal inflictions, diseases, &c. The other phrases will express the matter as it is common to the Apostles times with all after ages, the ecclesiasticall discipline, not as it differs from, but as 'tis al one with the Apostolical, devested only of that one consequent among them, the corporal inflictions.

In this rank is the *ἡ ἀποκρίσις* I will not spare, 2 Cor. 13. 2. ex- Sect. 88. plained, v. 10. by *ἀποκρίσις* *ἡ ἀποκρίσις*, abscission, and *ἡ ἀποκρίσις*, subtraction, taking away, or turning out of the Church; for I conceive the

the ver. is thus to be paraphrased. *These things I, now being absent, write to you, that when I come, I may not be forc'd to use acts of severity, according to the power which is given to me for edification (which I rather desire to make use of) and not according to the power which was given to me for destruction or excision.* So again, the ἔξα-λα μὴ συναναμύρωμεν 1 Cor. 5. 9. the Apostles command of not communicating or associating with such. It hath much troubled some scrupulous enquirers, where or when it was that S. Paul had thus written unto them, phansying it necessary to resolve that he had written some other Epistle to the Corinthians before this First. But sure the beginning of the Chapter will lay this scruple, for to that (and not to any other farther off) the [ἔξα-λα ἐν τῇ ἰ. ε. ταυτῇ ἐπιστολῇ, I have written in this Epistle that you should not company, &c.] doth belong, and that the [ἐν τῇ ἰ. ε. ἔξα-λα] I have now written, vers. 11. will enforce, for so in 3. 4 and 5. verses we read, *I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already as though I were present, concerning him that hath done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; when you and my spirit are gathered together with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan, &c.* The Apostle though absent, yet having an Apostolick ruling power or jurisdiction over them, passeth censure (as formally, as if he had been amongst them) upon that fornicator or incestuous person: and by that spirit or power of his, whereby he was present in their Assemblies, doth therein pronounce this censure of excommunications or delivering up to Satan against him, that by this means he may reduce that notorious offender (that is the importance of those 3. verses) and that others be not tainted by his example, verse 6. &c. And then verse 9. (having a little digress, v. 7, 8.) he resumes his matter again, and saith it over briefly in another phrase, with an ἔξα-λα μὴ συναναμύρωμεν, i. e. this then was it I wrote to you in, or, by Epistle, (because I was not present) that you should not company with such. By which it appears that the delivering a man to Satan, and the commanding μὴ συναναμύρωμεν are all one (or one but a light addition to, or variation from the other) all other men being so far concern'd in such a ones being so delivered, as not to company with him; yet that not so much (as men now a daies think) lest they should be polluted by him, (i. e. by that act of communion

with him, as under the Law by touching an unclean thing) as to help discipline him, that the insensate sinner may see himself left alone to no society but *Satans* (avoided, abandoned by all) and so be brought to a sense of his detestable dangerous condition, (and others kept from thinking his actions exemplary or fit to be imitated by them) And therefore though this discipline be not used upon sinners out of the Church, ver. 12. for they will not be wrought on by the Christians abandoning their company, yet saith St. Paul vers. 11. with a professor of Christianity, one that lives in the Church, and yet is guilty of this sin, or the like, *μὴ συναναμίσγῃς, μὴ δεσνῇς*, (for so I conceive the words must be joyned, all betwixt being in a Parenthesis) neither to company nor eat with him, in stead of which, 2 Thes. 3. 14. 'tis *μὴ συναναμίσγῃς* simply, onely with a *συνίμῃς* (which it seems is a preparative to it) set a mark, or brand upon him, and doe not company with him) which in either place whether it belong onely to exclusion from communion in *sacris*, or be to be extended to interdiction of ordinary civil society, I professe my self not over-confident; For the former onely this may be said. 1. That although the sound of the words, *μὴ δεσνῇς* (especially as we render it, *no not to eat*) seem to contain the latter also, yet perhaps the equipollence of that other phrase [delivering to Satan] may restrain it to the former. 2. Because the interdiction of co-verging or eating with Christian offenders might (now at least) make it necessary for a man to go out of the world, as well as the interdiction of heathen-fornicators company would have done then. 3. Because the phrase *ἐξαγῆς ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτοῦ* which in the close of the Chapter is set to expresse the former censure, is by the Canons of the Councils solemnly applied to these Ecclesiasticall censures, suspension either from the Church or from office in it.

Sec. 89.

And yet on the other side the Jews were so severe to some, as to deem it unlawfull either to eat or familiarly to converse with them, as *Samaritans*, *Publicans*, *heathens* and *sinners* (so call'd not *ἑταῖροι*, i. e. notorious sinners) and a notable evidence and example of that practice of theirs we have in the 2. book of *Maccabees*, where speaking of the *ἑταῖρους καὶ αὐτοῖς*, deserters, or those that fell off to any notorious breach of their law, the author saith, *ἐδεδωκοντο καὶ πόλεμους καὶ ἔδυνε ἔκρινον, καὶ κοινῆς διαστροφῆς*,

*ἀποκρίσις ἐχθρότης ἐστίν*, they did express a detestation of them, judging them as enemies of the Nation, and denied them the civility of common converse or good usage, all friendly entertainments, &c. and the same is called after in that place, *χωρισμός*, a separating from them, *ἀπορροή*, (though it be read corruptly, and without sense, *ἀπορροή*) averſation, and exprest by *ἀντιλογία* to *ἀντιλογία*, they appeared enemies to them: and even the Jewish *nidui* or first degree of excommunication, being a remotion *ad 4. passus*, not suffering any man to come within four paces of him that was so censured; was an interdiction of familiar conversation or eating with him. And therefore perhaps some of that their discipline may be here imitated, and retained; but then again for the former opinion, Christ by his contrary practice seemed to dislike that custom of theirs, and though he brought excommunication into the Church or in *ſacris*, 'tis not necessary he should continue that other that extended to civil commerce, and therefore still perhaps may not.

Seſt. 90.

The best deſiſion perhaps wil be, that this cenſure ordinarily belongs only to ſociety in *ſacris*; but yet ſometimes the ſtate of affairs ſo requiring, and when ſome other deſect may be ſo ſupplied, The Governours may proceed to the ſecond *interdict*, that no man ſhal talk familiarly, or entertain, or eat with them, that all men ſhall avoid their company, diſcountenance them, and not ſo much as ſay God ſpeed, allow them ordinary Chriſtian civility, by this means to beſiege, and ſtarve them up, and ſo, if poſſible, humble and reduce them. To which purpoſe it is obſervable what the learned and judicious *Hugo Grotius* *marginus* hath noted concerning this matter, that in a Chriſtian Church where either through the recentneſſe of their plantation *communes conventus non ſunt*, there are no conſtant common aſſemblies of the Chriſtians in it, or wherupon the ſame occaſion there is no ſettled Government in the hands of a Biſhop and aſſiſtent Preſbyters, or where the Church is torn aſunder by *Schiſmes*, (as in *Corinth*, when this firſt Epiſtle was written, chap. 11. 18. whence it follows, v. 3. That judgments or cenſures were neglected, and upon that neglected, diſeaſes and deaths among them. (I would, I could not ſay among us alſo) whereas at the writing of the ſecond Epiſtle, the diſcipline together with a quiet judicature was reſto-

red,





monition, and therefore in this case, where the Governour (who is representatively the Church it self, a publique, no private person) after a first and second admonition (and the second with one or two, perhaps with some or all of the College of Presbyters joyned with him) comes to be despised, the *ἄνωγ* follows, or proceeding to censure without any third admonition interposing. Which will appear to be the practice, if you look 2 Cor. 13. 2. where immediately after the second admonition, in the *ἄνωγ* τὸ *ἐκτομῆν*, characterized v. 11. by *ἐν τῷ στόματι δύο ἢ τρεῖς, &c.* he tels the offenders, *ἰσχομαι*, I will not spare, i. e. I will proceed to censure: and ver. 10. he tels them, that this admonition is, *ἵνα μὴ ἐκτομῆν ὑμᾶς*, that I may not proceed to excision, or cutting off, (for *ἐκτομῆν* or *ἐκτομή*, which we render sharpnesse, signifies) which is there called *καταλείπον*, taking away, in the end of the verse: the very word which is so ordinary in the ancient Canons, *καταλείπον*, tollatur, for the censure of excommunication.

Señ. 92.

And the reason is there rendered, because you may know that such an one, that holds out against those admonitions of the Church or rulers thereof. *ἑἷς ἐστὶς, ὃς ἀπειθεῖ*, is a perverse wilful sinner, *ὡς αὐτοκαταλείπον*, being self-condemned, i. e. I conceive by that non-submission to the Churches admonitions, he withdraweth and divideth himself from that communion, and so inflicteth that punishment upon himself, which the censures of the Church are wont to do on malefactors, for that is *καταλείπον*, 2 Cor. 13. 10. and *ἐκτομῆν*, cutting off from the Church, which he being an heretick doth voluntarily without the judges sentence, his very *ἀπειρεῖς*, heresie being a willing *καταλείπον* or excision. So saith S. Jerome, whereas fornicators, &c. are turn'd out of the Church, the heretick *κ* inflicts this on himself, *suo arbitrio ab ecclesia recedens*, going of his own choice from the Church; which departing, *propria conscientia videtur esse damnatio*, seems to be the censure of ones own conscience: So in the Council of Laodicea, Can. 40. after an order that no Bishop shal disobey a citation, when he is called to a Council, 'tis added *εἰς ἡμετέρας ὁρῆς αὐτοὺς ἀρτίοντα*, if he contemns, he shal be conceived to accuse himself, which is the next degree to self-condemnation. So in the 22. Can. of the African Codes, (or in Justellus his Account, the 19.) the words are clear of a Bishop that b. ing accused b. fore a Conkil appears not, *αὐτοὺς ἑαλὼν* &

*κατα-*

ἡ ἀποκρίσις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀποστόλων, he shall be judged to have pronounced sentence of condemnation against himself, and so even in Philostratus. l. 7. c. 7. it is a saying of Apollonius. Ὁ δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀποκρίσις τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀποστόλων, he that shall decline a judgement, how shall he avoid the being thought to have condemned himself? So in the 12. Tables, *Presenti litem addico*, i. e. that he that absents himself, be alwayes cast; and so the Franks have alwayes observed it, *ut absens causa cadet, nisi Sannia nuntiasset*, that the absent should be alwayes condemned, unless he gave a just excuse of his absence. And the *Regule ab Abbate Floriacensi constituta* adde, *Qui non comparuerit, tanquam convictus judicabitur*, he that appeareth not, shall be judged as convict, i. e. *ἀποκρίσις*. If you would see this Interpretation more fully confirmed, I must refer you to *Marcusli formul. l. 1. c. 37.* and *Bignotius* on them, to *Stephan. Fornerius verum quod. l. 6. c. 21.* and out of him, *Jusselius* in the Notes on *Cod. Ecclesie universae*, p. 38. But enough of this.

I shall take in no more places to examine for this point of the nature of this power, save only those in the Gospel (with which this discourse began) which, as we have once gone over in relation to the first enquiry, so we shall now again in order to the second.

Sett. 93.

First, then, *Mat. 16. 19. δίδωμι σοι τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν*, [I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven] where 'twil be no news to him that is vers'd in the New Testament, if I tell him that *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, the kingdom of heaven, signifies the Church of Christ here below *Militant*, being not a disparate body but a fellow-member of Christ, with the other triumphant in heaven. I could weary my Reader with places to this purpose, ready at every turn to justify this interpretation, as when 'tis said of St. John the Baptist, *Mat. 11. 11.* that though from the beginning there had not risen a greater then he, (a more then Prophet in pointing out rather then prophesying of Christ, *ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, Behold the Lamb of God) yet *ἰμνησέτω* & *ἡ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν*, he least in this new Church, (this *μέλλων αἰών* - the age to come, as the Septuagint, *Es. 19. 6.* call it; & so *Heb. 2. 5* *οἱ αἰῶνες τῆς μέλλουσας* the world to come, and perhaps *Heb. 6. 5.* *δυνάμεις τῆς μέλλουσας αἰῶνος*, the powers of the age to come, i. e. of Christianity, & *ἐρχομένης βασιλείας*,

Sett. 94.

turnise the coming kingdom as the phrase in *S. Mark. 11. 10.* may I conceive, be rendered absolutely thus, *ευλογουν τὸ ἐρχομενον βασιλειαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*, Blessed in the name of the Lord of our father David; be the coming kingdom; or Blessed in the name of the Lord be the coming kingdom of our father David; this Church or kingdom of Christ here on earth, not hereafter in heaven (the least believer, at least teacher of the Gospel here (not Saint there) is greater then he. So *Mat. 8. 11.* upon the Centurions coming to Christ; and expressing so great measure of faith, that he professes not to have found the like in any Jew, he adds that *Many shall come from the East and West, all parts of the heathen world, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven*, i.e. as that Centurion did, believe in Christ and become one Church with the Jews, of whom *Abraham* the father of the faithful was the first) and the children of the kingdom (they that were till then the only Church, to wit, the rebellious unbelieving Jews) should be cast out. So clearly *Ch. 13. 24.* *οὐρανὸν καὶ βασίλειαν* τῶν οὐρανῶν, the kingdom of heaven, the Church here below, not the kingdom above, is likened, &c. For sure there are no enemies to sow, nor tares to be sown in heaven, which in this kingdom are there said to be, *ver. 15.* (as *Rev. 12. 7.* the war that is mentioned in heaven may be an argument that heaven in that place signifies the Church here below, which onely being Militant can be said to have war in it) and so in the other Parables in that Chapter. I have named enough for an hint to any to observe many more in this Gospel, *Chap. 18. 1, 3, 4. chap. 19. 24, 25. chap. 20. 1. chap. 21. 43.* and (which is a little nearer to the phrase in this place) *chap. 23. 13.* the Pharisees shutting up the kingdom of heaven before men, i.e. keeping men from entering the Church, from becoming Christians, and the like also in the other Gosp. ls. If this notion of the kingdom of heaven do yet seem alien, or forced, or lesse proper for this place, then you may but please to observe, that a key refers to a lock, a lock to a door, or entrance to any place, and then the Church being supposed the door or gate, the only way of passage to heaven, these keys, of the door itself must be the keys of the Church below, as of the door that leads thither, and then that will return to the same issue still.

So

So then, Peter, and in him the rest of the *Apostles* and successor-governors of the Church had the keys of the Church given them, i.e. clearly a power of shutting out, or receiving in to the visible Milicant Church, of removing the contumacious by *censure of Excommunication*, and receiving in the humble penitents by *absolution*, and so of *binding* and *loosing*, (as it follows) *אֲנִי יְהוָה*, here below, upon the earth, answerable to that exception of the *Baraita* *אֲנִי יְהוָה*, (for the Church) premised, and just agreeable to the phrase, *Mark* 2. 10. *אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה* to forgive sins on earth, which (it appears by the mentioning of the keys as the foundation of this power) signifies receiving men into the Church, disexcommunicating, and therefore the binding is there peculiarly the *censure of Excommunication*, and nothing else; *וְאֵין יְהוָה נִשְׁלָח*, the thing we undertook to shew from hence.

From whence by the way may be understood the meaning of that place, *Mat* 12. 32. *it shall not be forgiven him*, (*אֲנִי יְהוָה*, impersonally) *he shall not receive absolution*, either in this world, i.e. in the Church from the Ecclesiastick *censure*, nor at the day of judgement, i.e. in the world to come, the phrase seeming to me to refer, to that rule among the Jews mention'd before out of *תלמוד* *tr. de excom. Si quis iurat in hunc modum, &c.* If any man swear after this manner, [If this be not true, let me be excommunicated in this world, and in the other] and be perjur'd, he cannot be absolv'd by any: and then how ridiculous are they that ground a Purgatory on this place?

Sect. 96.

We shall not need to make any distinct survey of the second place, *chap* 18. 18. because (as to the matter of this power, our present enquiry) it is *verbatim* (only the number and some little unimportant circumstances changed) the same with this former place, *אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה*, & *אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה*, binding and loosing in the earthly part of the Kingdome of Heaven, the Church below. One thing only it will not be amiss again to add as an appendage common to these two places (though we mentioned it before) and it is this, that [th: *אֲנִי יְהוָה*] the mention of *absolution* is (in both) an attendant of the *absolution*, or binding precedent, as indeed *loosing* generally presupposes a *band*, and therefore *Act* 2. 24. where we read, *אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה דָּאֲדָרָה* and render it, (*loosed the pains of death*) 'tis sufficiently clear, and consist that

Sect. 97.

R

ו' י' י' י' י'



*ἀφίρη* are there taken for *ἀφίρη* or *ἀφίρη* (by the equivocallness of the Hebrew word *קשר* which signifies both, & is rendred by the 72. sometimes *קשר*, a band, sometimes *קשר*, a pang of travail) and so should be rendred in that place, *bands of death*, in relation to which it follows, *he could not be holden*, &c. which intimates *absolution* to be in *universum*, or absolutely necessary onely to those that have been *bound*, and so only after *excommunication*, the *absolution* proportion'd to the precedant *censure*, and that the onely thing that lyes upon any, *necessitate precepti* here, or *medii* in any other respect, all other *absolution* without this precedent *binding* *censure*, being (though it may be allowed very useful & profitable for the comfort and satisfaction of the penitent, yet) neither *commanded*, or prescribed the Priest to give, nor the penitent to receive (at least by either of these two places.)

Señ. 98.

As for the third place, *Joh. 20. 26.* (which by some is thought to belong to somewhat else, rather then those censures of the Church, 1. Because the phrases are other, *ἀφίρη* and *κράτη*, remitting and retaining, in stead of *δέσσει* and *δέσσει*, binding and loosing. 2. Because the *ἀφίρη*, [*remitt*] is before *κράτη*, [*retain*.] And 3. because this is deliver'd to all the *Apostles* together, whereas the two other were spoken, one personally to *Peter*, the other of the *Church*) I in humility conceive, that as before we shewed that this place in *S. John* belonged to the same persons to which the other two belonged, to wit, the *Apostles* and their succeeding rulers of the Church, so it is perfectly parallel to them also in respect of the matter of the *Commission*; and my reasons are these : 1. Because the phrases, though (as the first reason pretends) other in sound, are yet directly synonyma's with the former in Scripture-file. I say that *ἀφίρη*, *to remitt*, is al one with *δέσσει*, *to loose*, and *κράτη*, *to retain*, with *δέσει*, *to bind*. And therefore *Theophylact* uses together *ἐξουσίαν ἀφίρης ἡ δεσμεύει*, power of remitting and binding, confounding the two places in *S. John* and *S. Mat.* together, and rendring *κράτη*, *to retain*, by *δεσμεύει*, *to bind*, and *δέσει*, *to loose*, by *ἀφίρης*, *to remitt*, in *Mat. 16. 19.* and so promiscuouly in other Writers. If there be the least difference it is onely this, that *δέσει* signifies to bind, and *κράτη*, to bind, and also to keep bound, in which respect *κράτη* is more proper here in *S. John*, because the order is inverted, and *κράτη*, retaining, put

put after ἀφίημι, remitting, and so the word which signifies also [to keep bound] or to not-remit, is more perfectly & critically agreeable, then *Nō* to bind would have been; and yet when binding is mentioned first, *ḥōra* as exact as *ḥōra*, as in the other places: But yet for all this light accidental difference, I shall not retract saying, the words are in use perfectly synonymous; ἀφίημι, remit, and λύω, loose; especially as applied to sin; both signify forgiving of it; the first as sin is taken under the notion either of a debt, or a thralldom, (for ἀφίημι is in the N. Test. applied to both, to the one in the Lords Prayer, to the other Luk. 4. 18. and both directly opposed to ἀγείρω) the second, as of a band; so in the Septuagints Translation of the Old Testament, Gen. 4. 12. (μὴ ἔσθ' ἡ ἀντὶς, perhaps false copied for ἀντὶς μὴ ἢ ἀποδύναμις, My sin is greater then can be forgiven) or more clear, γ. Exod. 32. 21. Ἐὰν μὴ ἀφίημι αὐτοῖς; ἢ ἀφίημι, If thou wilt, (or, O that thou wouldst) forgive them that sin; and in divers other places (ἀφίημι, remit) taken for forgive, and so in like manner λύω to loose, Job 42. 9. Ἰάωται ἢ ἀφίημι αὐτοῖς ὅσα ἔσθ' ἡ ἁμαρτία, (a Translation of the words which are in Hebrew אָפַתְנוּ אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ God accepted the person of Job praying for them) he forgave them that sin by Job, i. e. by his mediation. There λύω [to loose] is taken for [to forgive.]

So also for *Nō*, and ἀγείρω, to bind, and to hold or retain, the same Hebrew word שָׁבַע is rendred by the Septuagint, *Nō* (ἢ ἀσπάζομαι) Jer. 33. 1. and ἀγείρω, Dan. 10. 8. & 11. 6. and so Act. 2. 24. [ἀσπάζομαι] being holden, is set opposite to (λύω) loosing of bands, and so must signify keeping bound, (and in almost all other places it signifies to hold fast, or take hold of, Mat. 18. 28. 21. 46. 26. &c. and is sometimes joyned with ἔσθ' as holding fast is precedaneous, and preparative to binding, Mat. 14. 3. ἀσπάζομαι ἔσθ' αὐτόν, laying hold on him, bound him, and Apoc. 20. 2. ἐσθ' ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὸν θάνατον, held and bound) and so ἀγείρω, though rendred to retain, is taken for *Nō* to bind also, (or if there be any difference, tis this, that it signifies lesse then binding, rather then more, and so will not conclude any thing which the former places were not able to conclude.) And so you may observe in the Fathers, viz. S. Basil, speaking of the freedome of Christians in their bands, he saith they are ἀσπάζομαι καὶ ἀγείρωται, bound, but not capable of binding; and many the like.

Secondly, because the inverting of the order of words is too light and casual a thing to be argumentative, and therefore the second reason is of little force, being taken onely from that change, for which yet some reasonable account also may be given from the variety of the words, w<sup>ch</sup> caused this inversion, and consequently no more argument will be deducible from this change of order, then from the change of words would be just to deduce: If the change of the words would argue ought, then I confess the inverting of the order, caused by that, would *per modū accumulationis* do so too; but that being once cleared to import no new thing, this which is onely attendant on that, cannot be thought to do so, & so there will be no need of farther answer to that, when the former hath bin sufficiently answer'd.

Señ. 100.

Thirdly, because the third ground of scruple is as unconvincing also, the other two being delivered to all the Apostles also, as well as this: the first to all in S. Peters person, (as 'tis ordinary for Donations made to Communities to be delivered to one of that number for the use of all) as is acknowledg'd by all but those, whose pretended interest in S. Peter hath bribed them to inflame his, and lessen the other Disciples prerogative, as much as they can. And the second in plain words with a preface of *Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*, *Verily I say to you*, i.e. to the Disciples with whom the discourse had continued by way of mutual colloquie from the beginning of the Chap. This I am sure is the affirmation of the Greek Fathers, particularly Theophylact on Mat. 13. where he affirms that promise of the power of binding and loosing to be fulfilled in those words of Christ in S. John, *Whose sins you do remit, &c.* the place was formerly set down at large, and need not be repeated; and if you examine the word *cessare* throughout the N.T. you will have no temptation to doubt it.

Señ. 101.

Having now declared out of the Scripture the foundation & progresse of this power, these censures, and occasionally interweaved the interpretation of some places which I conceive to depend on this matter, it were now a fit season to proceed to the writings of the *ancient Church*, and draw down the *history* of this practice through the *first & purer times*: But that hath been

*De rep. Eccl.* so faithfully performed by many others, particularly by *Spal-lingham*, that it would be a great insolence to attempt to do it better.

better. Only it will be worth our rehearsing, (though we only refer you to that *Magazin* for all further explication of it) that there were some nice differences observed in this matter between the binding which was a censure, and the other which was only a punishment, the one conceived to bind in heaven, the other not. 2. Berwixt the binding of the refractory impenitent, and the humble consistent penitent: the first for the cure and removing the scandal of some notorious crime; the second on his voluntary confessing his crime, and submitting himself to be bound by way of penance, that so by being loosed again, he might be the more sure of that pardon in heaven, which is promised to those which are absolved on earth, & so proper *maiores cautelam*, to satisfy the trembling conscience, and assure it that God hath forgiven him.

These are excellent profitable subjects, in which I desire the Reader will satisfy himself out of those judicious Collections of that very learned unhappy man. And if it be now demanded of me, whether private absolution be not contained under the importance of these places? I answer, that this last distinction hath in effect answered this question, and defined, that in case of private binding it doth come under it, and that that, though in some sense it be left *ad libitum*, or voluntary to the penitents will or choice, is yet necessary to every one whose conscience either is not able to perform & go through the work of inward repentance with God alone, or is not able to satisfy it self with such performance without the Ministers assistance called in.

To which purpose I shall desire that that may be considered Sect. 102 which is delivered by our Church in the second Exhortation before the Communion, in these words: Because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy Communion but with a full trust in Gods mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any among you, which by the means aforesaid (which were to examine their lives by the rule of Gods commandments, and wherein they shall perceive themselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewaile their own sinful lives, and confesse themselves to Almighty God with full purpose of amendment; and if their offences be also against their neighbours, then to reconcile themselves to those, with readinesse to make restitution and satisfaction for wrong done, and to forgive others that have offended them) cannot quiet his own conscience,

case, but requireth further comfort or counsel, then let him come to me, (i.e. his lawful Pastor) or some other discreet and learned Minister of Gods Word, and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved, and that by the ministry of Gods Word he may receive comfort, and the benefit of absolution, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding all scruple and doubtfulness. All which being an exhortation of the Church belonging to a particular case, [when a man by the use of all helps which are within his own reach, cannot attain to quiet of conscience, or be satisfied that he is fit to receive the holy Communion;] as they do imply that those foresaid means may happily serve the turn, without opening his case to the Minister, and consequently without receiving absolution, so are they a fervent exhortation to all, in case those means prove not successfull, to seek out, & make use of those auxiliaries, which whosoever in that case shall neglect, will be guilty of great unkindness to his own soul, and may well be thought to have betray'd it to great and needlesse danger. And it is worthy our noting from hence, that receiving of comfort, & the benefit of absolution are by our Church here conjoynded, to signifie this absolution to be beneficial to him that once wanted comfort, as a meanes of confirming that comfort which the Minister had now given him. To which end certainly 'tis very proper & seasonable: for when a discreet & learned Minister, having had the survey of my soul, (the cognizance of my offence first, & then of my repentance) shall from the word of God give me assurance, that (if I am what to him I appear to be) my estate is good, & thereupon pronounce me absolved, as a true penitent from all my sins; This will, 1. seal me a right of Gods promise of forgiveness in heaven, as it were solemnly and in the Court; and 2. extremely quiet me, and confirm to me that comfort, i.e. that comfortable opinion of my good estate, and hope of my future happiness, which he had given me, when I see him who hath no reason to be partial to me, and whom I cannot suspect of ignorance, or passion in this particular, (both which perhaps I may upon enquiry discern in my self) and beside, who is set over me by Christ to this purpose, pronounce so clear a sentence of me, and that (as the precedent words are) by the ministry of Gods word, i. by applying peculiar parts of the  
infallible



infallible truth to the present condition of my soul, and from thence pronouncing my *absolution*. And that this is the meaning of the *absolution* there, it is evident by that which is the second thing, which I thought worthy our observing from hence, *viz.* what is added in conclusion, as the ultimate end of that *comfort* and *absolution*, the *quieting of conscience*, and *avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness*; which whether they be distinct, so that the *quieting of conscience* may be the *completion* of the *comfort*, and the *avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness*, the end intended in, and obtained by *absolution*, or whether both together *indiscreet* belong to both together, the product will be still the same, that in case a man be not able to satisfy his own *scruples* and *doubts* concerning himself, the *Presbyter* will be able to stand him in good stead, by the *Word of God* applied to his case to *give comfort*, and by pronouncing *absolution* to him to seal that *comfort*, and persuade him to a greater *confirmation* of mind, that that *comfort* is not *groundlesse*, and so take away *doubts* and *scruples* concerning that matter which before molested him, and made him unfit for the *Communion*, which was the only occasion of the *exhortation*.

Beside this, it is also true, that in case of *sickness* S. *James's* advice (if not *command*) is *punctual*, that the *Presbyters* of the Church be call'd for, and that they shall anoint the sick (a ceremony used in those dayes by *Christ* and his *Apostles* in the curing of diseases, and casting out devils, not so much as a *ward* toward our last great journey, as among the *Romanists* 'tis continued, but either as a *sign* of our *Spiritual* cure, or as a *means* sanctified by prayer to cure the sick, to deliver from the disease in the beginning of the verse) *καὶ ἀνστήλας ἡλείουσι, ἀγιδοῦσθαι αὐτὸν* and if he be that have committed sin, *absolution* shall be given him; for so that phrase will be most grammatically rendred, not [they shall be forgiven him] for then it would be *ἀγιδοῦσθαι*, nor that [God shall forgive him] for then it would be *ἀφῶν*, to agree with, *ἐγὰρ Κύριος* immediately precedent, the Lord shall raise him, but impersonally *remittetur ei*, he shall have *absolution*. Of which *absolution* there is little question, but that it is a very proper preparative to curing of his disease which is oft sent to awake some drowsie sinner, and is not removed til it have done the work in some measure, *Eccles.* 38.9, 10. & therefore the ordinary preface

Sect. 103.

to Christs cures, is [Son thy sins are forgiven thee] as 2. Mac. 3. when Heliodorus had been so scourged for his sacrilegious enterprize, and the high Priest offered sacrifice for his recovery, verse 32. the Priest is said to have made an attonement; and thereupon God granted him his life, verse 33. and so Eccles. 2. 11. before Gods delivering in time of tribulation, there is first his ἀλυσιν αὐτοῦ, remitting of sins, before releasing from the pressure; and secondly, that absolution, as it is the Ministers act peculiarly, and an act of benediction in him, contrary to the execration in the cherem, or anathema, may well be thought in common reason to have benign influence on the Patient, as the curses of Parents are generally believed to be fatal curses. Δυναὶ γὰρ γαῖαν Ἐβρύς, εἰσι τοῦτον in Orpheus, the curses of Parents are stored furies that haunt a man where ever he goes on the earth, have an inauspicious influence on all his earthly prosperities, devour and eat out his patrimony; and so also by the rule of contraries, the blessings of Parents, Eccles. 3. 9. may avails toward the removing of temporal calamities, and so consequently, the prayers and blessings, and absolution of the Presbyter the spiritual father. Thirdly, there will be as little question who shall be the Minister of it, when 'tis considered that there is no supposition or presumption in that place of the presence of any, but onely of the πρεσβύτεροι ἑκκλησίας the Presbyters of the Church, and as little will there be of the fitnessse, and exceeding expedience, that the sins of which he is so peculiarly to receive absolution should be confessed, and bewailed before him, from whom the absolution is expected. One thing only the context may perhaps farther import, that this Presbyterial absolution may not be (by force of that place) so absolutely necessary to all sick persons, but onely to the αὐτοῖς πεποιθώς, to him that hath (formerly, & so as upon examination of himself, he may reasonably impute his sickness to it) committed sins, either as the word αὐτοῖς denotes greater sins, or as sins contrary to our duty towards God, whose Minister the Presbyter is, or as ποιεῖ αὐτοῖς signifies to live indulgently in sin, and so as it is not reconcilable with a \* regenerate estate, as long as it continues. For 'tis worth observing what follows in that place, James 5. 16. Confesse τὰ παραπτώματα your transgressions ἀλλήλοις to one another, one brother, i. e. Christian to another, the sick to them in health,

\* He that is  
born of God,  
ἢ ποτε ἁμαρ-  
τίας, doth not  
commit sin,  
1 Joh. 3. 9.

as *παιδες ἀλλήλοις ὑποτάσσεται*, Be ye all subject to one another, 1 Pet. 5. 5. i.e. all that are *inferiours*, to all *superiours*. Where, whether *συνέσιμα* signifie a trespassse peculiarly against our brethren, or whether (as 'tis resolved by *Grammarians*) lapses, or *lighter sins*, it seems to be here set in a distance from (if not opposite to) *ἀμαρτίας*, the greater sins, or those against God; and then as the confession of them to the *Presbyter*, Gods officer, will in any reason be most proper, to obtain comfort on safe grounds, and the benefit of *absolution* upon sincere repentance; so in those sins of an inferiour rank confession to the *wronged brother*, or to whatever fellow-Christian, may possibly be sufficient; and assuredly not *unuseful* or *unnecessary*, if it be but for the obtaining of the brothers united prayers, to help to remove the *sicknesses*, if that be inflicted (as oft *sicknesses* are) as a *punishment* for any such trespassses. In which case as the promise is there given of recovery to the sick upon those other mens prayers, and not otherwise, so there is little hope that God will accept thy *private prayers* for removing that punishment, till thou go and reconcile thy selfe unto thy brother, and desire and obtain his prayers for thee, (as Gods for his friends) when thy injuring of him had cryed to heaven, and fetch't down that *infliction* on thee.

Nay thirdly, there will be little matter of doubt, or controversy, but that *private*, frequent, spiritual conference betwixt fellow-Christians, but especially (and in matters of high concernment and difficulty) between the *Presbyter* and those of his charge, even in the time of health; and peculiarly, that part of it which is spent in the discussion of every mans *special sins* & *infirmities*, & *inclinations*, may prove very useful and advantageous (in order to spiritual *directions*, *reproof* and *comfort*) to the making the *Man of God* perfect. And to tel truth, if the *pride* and *self-conceit* of some, the *wretchlesnes* of others, the *basefulness* of a third sort, the *nauseating*, and instant satiety of any good in a fourth, the *follier* of men, and *artifices* of *Satan* had not put this practice quite out of fashion among us, there is no doubt, but more good might be done by *Ministers* this way, then is now done by any other means separated from the use of this, particularly then by that of *publick preaching*, (which yet need not be neglected the more when this is used) which hath now the fate to be cryed up, and

See 104.

almost solely depended on, it being the likelier way, as *Quintilian* saith (comparing publick and private teaching of youth) to fill narrow-mouth'd bottles, (and such are the most of us) by tacking them single in the hand, and pouring in water into each, then by setting them altogether, and throwing never so many buckets of water on them.

Señ. 105.

I conceive, I have now distinctly set down the full importance of this power of binding & loosing, and how it belongs peculiarly to the publick censures of the Church, the binding by way of excommunication, or depriving of the common benefits of Christians, (together with that branch of corporal discipline, or inflictions on mens bodies, peculiar to the Apostles times and power) and the loosing, in restoring the excommunicate person upon repentance to the Assembly of the Saints. And by this perhaps may be received some satisfaction to that question agitated sometimes, Whether Absolution in the Church be onely declarative, or moreover ministerially authoritative? which question will not now have so much place, the matter being thus stated. For the Churches absolution being not the actual eternal pardon of sins in Heaven, (which is left to be Gods work, none but he justifying sinners, except by way of consequent upon this promise of Gods) but peculiarly the freeing the penitent from Ecclesiastical censures here below, & from that other farther obligation that arose from the Churches binding, there will be no matter of doubt, but as the Governour of the Church authoritatively by commission from Christ, preacheth the Word, administreth Sacraments, and inflicteth censures, so he may authoritatively too, absolve on earth, free from punishments in the Church inflicted on sinners, without any necessity of interposing or meddling (save only indirectly, or as I said by way of consequence) with that which is due from God to them in another world; to which purpose 'tis ordinarily observable in the Canons of the Councils, that a pace Ecclesie arceri, being driven from the peace of the Church, is the expression of being excommunicated, and pacem dari, is to be received into communion again. In other places we find both together, *communio pacis*, communion of peace, all noting that, which excommunication deprived them of, to be the peace or favour, or pardon of the Church peculiarly, and not Gods peace, or pardon, or favour directly, but either by supposing

Council. Eliezer.

Can. 61.

Can. 47.

posing the person fit to be so dealt with, to be formerly deprived by God of that, or by way of consequence accidentally, more surely fastning him under Gods disfavours, if this wrought not on him the good desired effect of reformation.

To all which, by way of *Corollary I* shall adde, that the bare *binding* of the Church (abstracted from our contempt of, and perverse standing out against it) cannot damn any which is not otherwise (and if he were not thus bound) in a damnable estate that is, hath not any real influence on his damnation (save only to bind him farther to it, in case he doth not submit to it) distinct from that which proceeds from his *sin*, upon which he is bound, and from his *refractorinesse* continued in, in despite of this *censure*, (which no doubt may make his case more highly dangerous, as the Word is the favour of death to them that believe not) but is rather a means tending, as it is designed, to the saving of him, as in the next Chapter shall appear.

On the other side *loosing* on earth, or the *absolution* of the Church shall not free any *impenitent* unreformed sinner, in *foroceli*, i. e. obtain pardon for any that is not contrite, (much lesse turn *attrition* into *contrition*, as the *Romanists*, or a *votum penitentiae*, a *wishing we were penitent* into *penitence*, as others dream) but will rather be a means of *damning* him the deeper, of *betraying* him to, and *hardning* him in an *impenitent* estate, who is absolved, or freed from under that *discipline* before he be reformed; which therefore the Church in pure Charity to the man is bound not to do, but to continue him under the punishment till it produce the *reformation*.



## CAP. V.

Sect. 1.

FOR the third enquiry, the end or use to which this binding is designed, &c. there will not be so much occasion to enlarge; 'tis speedily stated by answering, that the whole end, aim, design in inflicting of publique Church-censures, may be reduced to these three heads; 1. *ῥυθισμός*, for reformation of the offender: 2. *ἀποκατάστασις*, the repairing, or making up the honour of the Church, which suffered by him: and 3. *παράδειγμα*, that others may be warned by the example of his punishment, and not corrupted by example of his sin, but especially to reform those by these sharper methods, which no other calmer means of admonitions will work on, to cut off that member that balsams will not cure, or keep from gangrenine, according to that of the writer of the Answer *Ad Orthodox*: *Ὅτι δὲ τὰ μακροθύμια ἢ ὁ ἐκείνου ἐν ἡμῶν σὺνδωρις, τότε ἡ ἀποκατάστασις τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποκατάστασις, ὅταν ὑπομένοντες οὐ μετανοήσαντες, οὐκ ἀποκαταστήσονται*, when by long-suffering offenders are not reformed, then excision to them which are not corrigible, is more useful then clemencie. For both those distant wayes, 1. Of application of plaisters; and 2. Of excision, are the same Physicians methods of preserving the whole, and proportionably to them the ministration of the Word and Sacraments are the Churches first method, and when that fails to produce its effect, this other of censure is the second, (and upon the good working of that, Absolution) wherein the Governours of the Church are truly *ἐντονεύοντες*, or co-workers with Christ, to bring back sons unto God, as they are to beget them in the preaching of the Word.

Sect. 2.

To which purpose you may see and observe what the Apostle constantly adds to his sentences of binding, or excommunication, or delivering up to Satan, *ἵνα σῶσθαι τὸ πνεῦμα*, 1 Cor. 5. 5. the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved, &c. So of Hymenæus and Alexander. Tim. 1. 20. I have delivered them up to Satan, *ἵνα μάταιοι ᾖ τὸ σῶμα, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ*, that they may be disciplined, instructed, taught not to blaspheme, or resist contumaciously; whence the word *ματαιόω* (which we render taught) in a common notion, may perhaps be more critically taken in a notion peculiar to this purpose,



Sacraments, &c. unless he will walk worthy of so honourable a vocation; the second to set him his task of repentance, to prescribe him some *severities* & probations, by which he shall be discerned whether he be in earnest contrite and willing to make his peace with Heaven, to take any the most laborious course to approve himself to Christ. The former of these in the act of excommunication, the latter in imposing the penance, upon which he shall be received again, & both together to bring sinners to repentance.

Señ. 4.

When sinners by *obstinacy* provoke God, 'tis his manner to withdraw his grace, to deliver them up to themselves, (a worse kind of devil or Satan) that by this means they may see their former forlorn condition, their vileness first, and then their danger, & so he sets to bring the secure, proud sinner to humility, to the use of prayer, & wrestling with God, to raise him out of this sad estate. And so the Church in like manner by Christ's direction withdraws the benefits and privileges of Christians, from those whom it judges *contumacious*, delivers them up to plain barbarousness, and *beastliness*, deals with them as God did with *Nebuchadnezzar*, driving him from the Court into the Wilderness, transforming him into the shape of a very beast; & all to this end, that his understanding might by that means return to him, the field teach him lessons of piety, whom the palace could not. Agreeable to which is that of *Pletho* upon *Zoroaster*, *As qurad frot as noxas mai dalmores, dy xstiqas dñ as dñdron dñor, frot curusinal no dñdñv fñ xanias avrñs, rñ dñvñ iynatadñvas*. The revengefull devils or fiends do gripe men to bring them off from sin, and set them on vertue.

Señ. 5.

And then as afflictions are one of Gods engines and stratagems to besiege, enter, and take the soul, (when he slew them, they sought him, saith the Psalmist.) So among the Apostles were those corporal afflictions, diseases, &c. superadded on purpose to make the impression more violent, and to work more effectually on their hearts.

Señ. 6.

The effectualness of which we may discern in one of the degrees of penitents in the ancient Church; namely *agonizantes*, whom we find weeping and howling in the Church-porch, not permitted to come in, lying without, for them that enter'd to tread on in their passage, which was certainly a means to make them prize those benefits more dearly, which they saw them-

themselves interdicted, and others partakers of, and without read them a Lecture of their own unworthiness, seeing themselves of the number of those dogs, and evil workers that are without.

The second end which I named, was the repairing the honour and dignity of the Church, which consisting in the purity of the lives of Christian professors, is necessarily lost both in the opinion of God, and men (especially those which are without) by the impieties and unchristian actions of any which are called by Christs Name, which is therefore by the Apostle said to be blasphemed or evil spoken of, when Christians fall into any notorious sins, and then there is no way to recover the reputation of the Church, and even of the Christian Religion, and in a kinde, of Christ himself, but by expressing the wrath and displeasure of the Church against those who walk thus inordinately, and so proclaiming unto all, that Christianity is not a Doctrine (as Zozimus, and Celsus, and Julian mistook it) of security or impunity to any sort of impenitents, but of strict, precise, exact purity, though some ungracious persons walk contrary to those prescriptions: This is the only *tabula post naufragium*, plank or means of relief, when the fame and good name of the Church is thus ship-wracked, and so fit to be designed in the second place.

Secl. 7.

A third gain and profit designed by these censures is the warning and admonishing of others; not lest they should be polluted by presence among the profane, as they that toucht the nuclear thing were polluted under the Law, (any farther then by the spreading, leprous quality of their example) which is the common error of the proud fastidious Pharisees of all ages, and is clearly confuted by St. Paul, 1 Cor. 5. 10. where the *μη συναναμύγνυτε* is not extended to beathen fornicators, which sure would be able to pollute by society, as much as Christian sinners) and by Clemens or that ancient Author under his name, *Constit. Ap. l. 2. c. 14.* who hath a notable place to fortifie against this mistake, speaking of those which (*ἀνελπίως λέγουσι μὴ δεῖν τοῖς τοῖς συμμολύνουσιν, μήτε λόγον κοινωνεῖν*) unmercifully affirm that men ought not to pollute themselves by accompanying with sinners, nor converse with them, (*αὐτοὶ δὲ αἱ συμεκλήαι ἀγνοούντων ἐπὶ δεδόν, καὶ αὐτὴ περνοῖαν, ἀλόγον καὶ κεῖσθ, καὶ θνητῶν ἀμείλιτων, ὅ καὶ γινώσκουσιν ὅτι καὶ φιλανεισθαι καὶ ἐπὶ λόγῳ*

Secl. 8.

abyſſes of men that know not God and his providence; of unreasonable judges, and untamed beaſts. For they obſerve not that the communion with ſinners that muſt be avoided, is not that of converſing with, but imitating of them, not ſpeaking, but doing with them.

Señ.9.

But the deſign is to ſet a brand upon ſuch ſins, which otherwiſe might haply be thought imitable, and inſenſibly grow into faſhion, and ſo infect, and pollute, were not men thus told of their uglinneſſe, ſhew'd their deformity, and fore-warn'd of their danger, which is ſure another act of mercy to all eaſie, ſeducible ſpectators, to the Church it ſelfe, and to him whoſe ſcandalous ſins are by this means hindred from being damners of other men.

Señ.10.

And as the cenſures themſelves, ſo the inexorableneſſe, or at leaſt, difficulty of ſome Ages, (of Canons, of Councils, and practice of Churches) in granting of abſolution to penitents, that alſo hath been deſigned out of pure charity to help multiply their fruits of repentance, to ſet a value on Gods Ordinances, to quicken their zeal, to demonſtrate their ſincerity both to others, and to their own ſouls, each of which might perhaps be miſſing, if abſolution were over-eaſily obtainable.

Señ.11.

All which the more it is weighed, (how this institution of Chriſts, (beſides that, as 'tis ſo, it ought not to be neglected) is an act of ſpecial Chriſtian charity in not ſuffering ſin upon thy neighbour, but in any wiſe rebuking him, Lev. 19.17.) the more reproachful wil it be to this age of ours, the more bitter Paſquin, and laſting *σμερτήτιον*, when it ſhall be told in *Gath* and *Askalon*, that for ſome years the arts of ſome uncharitable men have ſo prevailed, that all exerciſe of this institution of Chriſt hath been caſt and kept out of this Church of ours; the firſt, I think, that is recorded ſince Chriſts time to have continued any conſiderable ſpace without liberty of uſing that power of the keyes in excommunication, left unto the Church by Chriſt. The Lord be merciful to us in this matter.

Señ.12.

As for them who either look upon this in others (or uſe it themſelves) as a matter of ſecular advantage, or accruement either of power or gain to the rulers of the Church, and ſo as a carnal deſign or engine diſguiſed in the ſhape of a ſpiritual institution,



tion, and on that ground either are willing by their cabinnies to help rend it out of the hands of the Church, or being themselves in place, either by passion, or mistake, or sloth betray it to the odium & censure of other men (whose shortness of discourse cannot separate the order from the person, or the abuse from the institution) I shall suppose they will change their minds & their practices, when I shal have given them one advertisement, which I may hope to do more effectually, not onely by putting them in mind of S. Chrysostoms judgment, who in this very matter having resolv'd *ἐν μὲν αὐτῇ τῇ ἰστορίᾳ ἀγία*, &c. that the sacerdotal dignity in pardoning and retaining of sins is very great, expresses that presently by this only way of probation, that a Priest if he live never so well himself, if he be not accurately careful of other mens lives, *ὅς τις πορνείᾳ ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ ἀναίῃ*, he bears those wicked men, which he reform'd not company to hell; and often when he is not betrayed by his own, he perishes by others mens sins, if he have not done all things rightly, which may tend to their recovery, and in that, sounds all the respect and obedience that St. Paul requires to be paid to the *ἐκκλησίαι*. But also, and especially if I present it to them in a brief paraphrase of one place of Scripture, which by mistake and rash judgement, is wont to be produced against all exercise of power in Church-men, but being rightly weighed, as it doth not take away the power which we onely plead for, that of exercising charity, of disciplining, reforming, i.e. doing the greatest good to those that are placed under us so will it teach every man (to whom that power is entrusted to learn nothing but meeknesse and diligence, and all kinde of Christian temper from the condition and peculiarity of this *ἐκκλησία*, and authority of his.

The place is that known Text *Mat. 20*. I shal deduce it from the beginning of the sense, & lay it plain before you. *V. 21*. The mother of Zebedees children (having heard by her sons of the promise made to the Disciples by Christ, *Mat. 19. 28*. that they should have the dignity of so many *κυβέτας*, which among the Jews, was a dignity next unto the Regal) petitions Christ in the behalf of her two sons, whom she conceived favoured by him above all the rest, judging it by the expressions to them two, & S. Peter; and her petition was this, That (seeing in the equality of

Sect. 13.

that

- that dignity promised to all, there might be yet, nay if (it were according to the old *Jewish* pattern, where the *sevilla* belonged to *Judas* and *Joseph*) must be some kinde of inequality, at least a precedence of some before others) her *Sons* that he had shewed such a speciall kindnesse to, might have that favour by him confer'd on them. *Jesus* repulses her demand by telling her, she is mistaken in the kinde of dignity, that should be inflated upon his disciples, 'twas not such a one as in any worldly respects would prove very desirable, but as a place of great burthen, so subject to great persecutions, and even death it self, of which indeed her sons should undoubtedly taste, as *Histories* testify they did. If this would not satisfie her, then let her know her importunity should gain nothing; for \* the disposing of any such honours, was to be according as God the Father had determined it, and although all power were conferred upon the Son by the Father, yet there was smal hope that the Son should thwart God the Fathers destination in any such act of dignifying any. This was fully satisfactory to the woman, and therefore she (nor her sons) reply not; But the rest of the Disciples upon advertisement what had past, begin to mock the two brethren, and so there is another tempest raised which Christ must also calm; and therefore to this indignation of the Disciples (not now to the ambitious request of the mother, or brethren) he accommodates an answer; that they need not be offended at the ambition of those brethren, for if they had had their desires, they had been but smal gainers by it; for in Christs Kingdome preeminence signified (or brought along with it) no great secular felicity, (such as was to be among Heathen Emperours (the great ones) and Princes, that being under them, and over others, were served and benefited by their subjects, which is meant by *Βασιλευς* v. 28. used their power in order to their own profits and pleasures, and pride; *αὐταυτοὶ ὡς ἄνθρωποι*, behaving themselves as lords and masters over so many servants, like those *Nabem*. 5. 15. where the following word *ἐξουσία* is used) But quite contrary, an office of burthen, and pains, and humility, and doing of service, (as *S. Mark* reads it more clearly, not *ἔγω*, but *ὑμεῖς*, chap. 10. 43. shall be your Minister) and he that will have that preeminence, must provide himself for that task, by the qualifications

\* ἐν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ  
 ἔειπεν αὐτῇ ὅτι  
 ἀπολύματι.  
 It is not mine  
 to give, save to  
 whom it is pre-  
 pared, &c.

tions which are most agreeable to that, and count of that way both of acquiring and enjoying it, for other wise it will not be had; (and upon these terms you need not envy them it) as you may guesse by Christ himself, whose *kingdome* in this world was of this nature, not administered in that way as might bring in splendour or profit to himself, but in acts of charity, ministering of all kinds of grace, enduring, and serving, and dying for his people, and not requiring that service, those offices from them, as other Kings have done.

This excludes not Disciples of Christ from power, (for he *Sett. 14.* regulates them by his own example, and no farther, and he, we know, was not onely as God, *King of kings* and *Lord of lords*, but as *Deus deus*, had all power given unto him in heaven and in earth, and in this his state of condescension here, he was a Master over his Disciples; and when he was called *Good master*, although he asked, *why he called him good?* yet the title of Master he disclaims not, nay tells them clearly that they did well, who called him Master, and *Kue*, Lord, *Joh. 13. 13.* But shews the lot that was like to befall them, the same it did him, whose greatness was expressed in *humility*, and *charity*, and *patience*, and offices of *servitude*; and so the greater any of them should be, the greater portion of these should be expected from them, as the appendage of their greatnesse, which consideration fully makes up the *78* *Λα-γυνή*, or rational importance of the place, which was to be answer satisfactory, 1. to the ambition of the two brethren, by dis- abusing them; 2. to the envy or indignation of the rest, by shew- ing, that preeminence was no fit object for any ones envy, but pity rather.

As for the use of *κατακείδω*, 'twil be best rendred to *lord it*, to play the *lord*, and the importance of that, discerned by the word *κατακείδω* that follows *v. 28.* or if you wil by comparing it with *1 Pet. 5. v. 3.* where 'tis explained by that which pre- cedes in the same sense, *ver. 2.* by *feeding*, or *governing*, (for so *κατακείδω* signifies) *ἀναγκάσας*, by force or violence, *ἀρρογαίδως* to make gain, *σίλβη*, unlawful gain, of the flock, which is all one with *κατακείδω*, (as in the Gospel, *heathen Kings* did over their people) and contrary to that, is *ruling* them by perswasion, *πειθίζω*, and *εὐθυμῶ*, making them *willing* and *ready* to do, what

they ought, and that by his own exemplary obedience, setting them patterns to transcribe, which certainly is the Clergy mans duty, (and best way of ruling, if it may possible prevaile) *by all which words, an arrogant, who must be no striker, no covetous person, Titus 1. 17. and to the same purpose, 1 Tim. 3. 3, 4, 5. and to sure 2 Cor. 1. 24. Kneeling signifies imperious behaviour in any kinde, as there over mens faith, very contrary to meek, gentle perswasion, the method that S. Paul and all followers of him ought to use, and I shall never excuse them if they doe not.*

*Self. 16.* All which I suppose not impertinent (as to justify the authority so) to limit and regulate the use of that, and determine it to that one Christian spiritual end, the reforming and winning, and saving of soules; a thing of all other, the most contrary to oppressing or violating, invading or tyrannizing over them, in brief (to them which have need of it) the onely reasonable Mercy and Charity in the World, thus in any wise to reprove, and not hate or suffer sin upon my brother.

*Self. 17.* For the other part of the 2. enquiry, who are the objects of these censures, subjected to the power of the keyes by Christ, I answer, 1. Negatively, that the supream Magistrate in every Kingdome is exempted from it, and not onely a posteriori, because the offering him up to shame and contumely (which is the work of excommunication) would be a certain means to expose him to the contempt of his subjects, and so be in danger to dissolve & shake the peace and settled Government of a Kingdom, (which I suppose to have been the design of that pestilent Romish Heildebrandine or Gregorian Doctrine, that the Subjects of an excommunicate Prince were discharged from their allegiance, which was but a smal encrease of the former doctrine (if that were supposed true) of Christs placing a power in the hands of the Church to excommunicate Princes; for from the concession of that, the other would generally follow of its own accord, and need no new doctrine to help it forward, the universal distemper of mens passions being a sufficient encouragement to the many, to cast off allegiance to those persons w<sup>ch</sup> they conceive themselves taught by Christ, and so by Christianity appointed to despise,) but also a

prior

priori, because Christ found the world dispos'd by his Father, in a regular subjection of all men to the powers placed over them (and those higher powers at the time of Christ's birth, as far as stories will help us to discern, were all Regal or Monarchical through the whole world) and was so far from changing that course by any new law of his, that he laboured by all means possible, to settle and confirm it on that basis, and not so much as to accept, when it was offered him, the exercise of any Sec. lar or civil power, but to submit himself, and consequently all his, and so all that can plead or pretend any title from him, (καὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ, καὶ υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, &c. say the Fathers) to the ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι, the supream power in any Kingdom. For the practice & opinion of the Church to this matter, through all times, infinite testimonies might be alleadged. I shall refer the reader to David Blondel in this book, *de formulâ Regnante Christo*, and not endeavour a further dis roving of that Doctrine which he thought more worthy of an exclamation in the language of Saint Athanasius, *ad Eust. Τίς ἤκουσεν τοιαῦτα πάλαι, ἢ τίς ὁ δίδεξα, ἢ μαδών, ταῦτα πόθεν ἐξῆλθε, ποῖον ἄνθρωπος ἐδίδεξατο, τίς ἡ ἡκούσα ἐκ ἀλλοσίου, ἢ ὅπως παρὰ χριστιανῶν; Who ever in the Church or among Christians, heard or taught, or learnt that Gregorian Doctrine? What an hell was it which vomited it out?* I shall add no more to the negative part, which being supposed, and to be remembered in that which follows.

P. 187, 188,  
189, &c.

I answer,

In the second place, positively, That the objects of this Church-charity or Church-censures are, Every open, notorious offender, (whose crimes come to our cognizance, whether by complaint of others, by notoriety of the action, or by his own confession) that lives, and indulges himself in any grievous crime, any wilfull sin; Every such I say is to be bound by the Church, when after admonition first lesse, then more publique, he continues refractory, unreformed, and not till then. The more shame for the easie denouncers of that censure, that either inflict it on every trivial commission, without consideration whether repented of or no; or that use this sovereign recipe, this generous medicamentum, (that, say artists, must not be cast away, either on the wanton or the desperate patient, but onely on those whom we see to

Sec. 18.



want it, and hope it may doe some good on) this strong physick, this last and most generous medicament so \*unadvisedly and uncharitably, so for any other end, rather then reforming of profane men.

\* Hence Avitus Alcinus, Ep. 61. to

Constantinus the Bishop, *Illud monere praesumo ne propter leves causas, & non ad Deum, sed saeculum pertinentes, ne Laici quidem, non dicam Clerici, sancta communione priventur, quia nescit cujus dignitatis sit ipsa communio, qui non eam omni animositate seposita & cum magno dolore suspendit, & cum maxima festinatione restituit. vid. Can. 2. Concil. Aurel. 5. & Leon. magn. Ep. 89. taxing Hilary for that fault.*

Señ. 19.

Then for loosing, who is capable of that, is agreed in general, the greatest sinners, upon approbation of their repentance: As for Novatus who denyed absolution to the Lapsi, he himself was censur'd and punished for that severity, as you may see in the 8. Can. of the Nic. Council, on which saith Zonaras ἀπεβλήθη ἐν ἀναθεματισμῷ, he was cast out and anathematiz'd in a council at Rome, Cornelius being Pope, and Decius Emperour, καὶ μὴ τιεῖ τὸ τίςιν ἰσχυλλετο, ἀλλὰ γὰρ διὰ τὸ ἀσυμπάδης αὐτῷ, καὶ μισοδιανοῦν, Though he offended not in matter of faith, yet for his want of compassion and kindnesse to the brethren.

But then, what degree of approbation will serve turn, what time of humiliation, what fruits and evidences of repentance may be thought sufficient to give capacity of this loosing; the judgement of Councils and Churches have much varied in that particular, the \* Roman being anciently milder then any other Churches; and how much these latter ages have been more favourable to the guiltiest sons of the Church, then the most mercifull of the first ages had learned to be, even those very Councils that condemn'd the severity of Novatus and the Cathari, are able to testifie; I will give you but an hint or two out of the Canons of the Council of Nice, (before quoted against Novatus) Can. 11. the Council speaking of them that fell in the time of Licinius his Tyranny, καὶ εἰς ἀνάγκης, ἢ καὶ εἰς ἀφαιρέσεως ὑπαρχόντων ἢ καὶ εἰς κινδύνου without any violence, or plundring, or danger of either, the censure is upon true and unfained repentance, ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν ἀπονομήσει ποιήσουσι, Three years shall they continue among the Audients (i. e. saith Zonaras, ἔξω τὸ ἐκκλησίας ἱερατὸς ἐν τῷ ῥόθῳ καὶ τῷ ᾄδειον ἀκούειν ἡρατῶν) stand without the Church in the Porch so long, and onely partake in hearing the holy Scriptures. Then

\* Vid. Gvo. in Heb. p. 820.

ἐξῆς τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας) (i. e. saith Zonaras, ἐν τῷ μύρῳ τῷ ἐκκοινωνίας ὡρίσθη, &c.) for the space of seven years more they have leave to be admitted within the Church, but to be behind a pillar, near the doore; and go out with the Catechumeni. Ten years already, you see, and yet farther, ἑξήκοντα ἔτη προσκομῶν κοινωμένοι καὶ λαὸς ὅς ἐκκοινωνῶν, Two years shall they joyn in prayer with the people; but without the oblation: i. e. saith Zonaras, they shall not yet be vouchsafed the participation of the holy things, till these two years be over. This approbation of their repentance cost them, it seems, no less than 12. years.

But then the same Council speaking of others, that having made some profession of Christian valour, like dogs returned to their vomit again, Can. 12. resolves, Δεὺς τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας μὴ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀποδόσεως ἔξωτον, After the three years in the porch among the audients, they must be ten years at the pillar; the seven years it seems are improved into ten, and tis probable the two years of communicating ἔξωτον ἔσονται still behinde, and so the probation fifteen years long.

Sect. 21.

One y the Bishop had power left him of the remitting of this severity, if he saw them (ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐκκοινωνίῳ ἐκκοινωνίῳ, ἐργασίῳ τῶν ἐκκοινωνίῳ ἐργασίῳ τῶν ἐκκοινωνίῳ, by humility and tears, and patience, and amideas, demonstrate their conversion to be sincere, not fained. And so Alcinus to Victorius the Bishop, *Autoritatis vestrae est, errantium compunctione perspecta severitas ordinem temporare*; 'Tis the part of your authority, when you perceive the compunction of those that have sinned, to temper the order of severity, i. e. to receive him earlier into the Church, Epist. 16.

Sect. 22.

That which might be added in this point out of the ancient Canons, wou'd be needless to relate, he that would see a particular description of the several degrees of these penitents, may have it very clearly set down in Zozomens History, l. 7. c. 17. and I shall not so much as enquire what grounds our latter ages have had to remit so much of the ancient discipline, till at length it be crumbled and moultered away into a nothing, or a meer formality: what is amiss in it, I beseech God may be reform'd.

Sect. 23.

I shall only add to this Chapter, that there have been in the practice of the Church, (I say not grounded in those Texts of the Gospel) two sorts of binding; One temporary or penitential when

Sect. 24.

when

when the person confesses himself penitent, and desires the Absolution of the Church, at least when there is hope of repentance, in which case the custome hath been to impose for some set time the *ἔργα ἀγία* *penitentialia*, such works as are agreeable to that repentance, and proportioned to the former sin, & not to absolve til what is imposed be performed. This the Nicene Fathers express by this style, [*ἵνα ὁν ἐν χρόνῳ ᾧ ἐρεται ἡ ἡμέρα τήνδε*] for whose penance the time is defined, and the season set, Zonaras by (*καὶ ἐν ᾧ ἐρεται τὴν ἡμέραν*) the space determined for the penance of those that had fallen: And Alcimus by *propositis observationibus interim ab Ecclesiâ sequestrari*, to be appointed some observances, and in the mean time to be sequestred from the Church: & note *excommunicationis inditio* donec publica penitentia professione desuescau, setting a mark (answerable to the *σημεῖον* in Saint Paul) of excommunication upon him, till by publique profession of repentance he disuse his former course, a kinde of *Nidam*, or temporary remotion; The second absolute, & *fine præfinito tempore*, without any certain definition of time. When men are refractory, and give no hope of amendment, and that is a kind of *Sebammatha*, Alcimus's irrevocable *anathema*, the binding over for ever, *perennis excommunicatio*, Turon. Concil. 2. c. 20. Paris. Conc. 3. can. 5. *or usque ad reformationem*, for ever if they reform not. The former of these is sometimes, but not alwayes, an exclusion, or abscession from the Church, (but sometimes on the other side a command to frequent the prayers of the Church, or the Sacrament, every Lords day for such a space, hath been the penance or discipline) nor consequently is it a binding that man to, that his sin is not yet pardoned on earth, but tis designed for other uses, for satisfaction to the Churches edification, &c. But they of the second sort are truly under that band, and cut off from the communion of the Church and by no means admitted to the services of it.

## C A P. VI.

**T**Here is but one enquiry now behind, i.e. what is the real effect of binding and loosing, or what conjunction it hath with binding and loosing in heaven. Which though it be the weightiest consideration of all the four, yet shall I have occasion to say least to it, and indeed only this, That a censure of the Church is a venerable thing, not only casting a Christian out of the Church, wherein he is appointed to seek salvation, and of which as long as he is thought unworthy, he is incapable of heaven; but withall a superaddition to the band in heaven, by which that sin is made indissoluble before God, till it be absolved on earth, or that absolution duly sought from the Church; Christ having affirmed of him, that in this case his sins shall not be pardoned there; as on the other side, that being by repentance return'd to that capacity, heaven shall return again to be his portion, and that pardon by the promise of Christ become due to him.

Sect. 1.

The plain reason of it is, The denunciation is irreversible, and indispensably universal, [Except you repent you shall all perish] and the promise as infallible and immutable [He that confesseth and forsaith, shall have mercy.] Now the binding, if it be as it should be (*clave non errante*) supposeth the man impenitent and refractory, and so to continue till he use means to return to the peace of the Church again; and then without controversy, whosoever is so bound on earth, (cast out of the Church for an impenitent and refractory, and continuing so) is bound in heaven, cast out from all title to that by God also. To which purpose is that known ancient passage in Tertullians Apol. speaking of these censures. *Judicatur cum magno pondere ut apud certos de Dei conspectu. Summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a communicatione orationis & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii relegatur.* c. 39. The judgements of the Church are exercised with great weight, as being among them that are certainly resolved that they are in the sight of God. And it is but a preparative pronouncing or passing of the future judgement, if any man offend so highly, that he be banish'd from communication or partaking of prayer, of

Sect. 2.

*Church-meetings, and all holy commerce.*

Señ. 3. But on the other side, he that upon his repentance, and approbation of that to be sincere, is (*clave non errante, still*) let into the Church again, is *ipso facto* supposed to have right, (and by his absolution that right sealed to him visibly, and Christs promise particular for it) to heaven.

Señ. 4. Now if it be demanded, Whether a true repentant sinner once bound by the Church be not presently loosed in heaven, i.e. pardoned and forgiven at the first minute of his repentance, without (or before he receive) absolution from the Church? I answer, that in case of publique or scandalous crimes, the reformation must be publique and notorious also. And to that purpose confession and satisfaction before the congregation, and him that bound, i.e. the Governour of the Church (to repair the injury done to the former by the ill example, and to testify the sincerity of the repentance to the latter) is necessarily requir'd to the approving of this repentance even to God, without which *non remittitur peccatum*, there is no more possibility of loosing in Heaven, then hope of absolution on earth. But on the sincere performance of this, as there is no doubt but God will have mercy, will loose in Heaven, will justify and pardon that (such a) penitent sinner; so is the Church-ruler on earth bound to loose him here below, to restore him to the Church also, as soon as by his submission to his penance he approves himselfe to him to be such; and though 'tis possible he may be sincerely penitent in Gods sight, before he appear so to the Church, yet is he obliged to seek thus to approve himselfe to the Church, if his case have come under her cognizance, or in case he desire to have any of that assurance which is to be had from the Church, or by title to the promise in those texts.

Señ. 5. And yet this exercise of the keyes is not to be conceived so absolutely necessary, that none can be damned without that seal of damnation, or binding, or non-forgivenessse, nor again that none can be saved, or forgiven without the seal of remission; For sure the neglect of the Bishop in the first case, his not-performing his office of excision, is no way able to rescue the impenitent from the eternal guilt and punishment of his sins, but rather a means to leave him remedilessse unto it (his binding being indeed such a  
remedy



remedy, if it be made use of) and the bare want of the remission or absolution, so it be joyned with readiness to perform all that is preparative to it, and an hearty desire to be partaker of it, is in the merciful, gracious court of Gods audience sure to be accepted, when there is no space or room for more. For the words of Christ (*whatsoever you shall bind, &c.*) though they be universal, binding all in Heaven that are bound on earth, yet are they not exclusive, so as none shall be bound in Heaven, but such as are bound on Earth, or in the Church below. Nor on the other side, [*whatsoever you shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.*] 'Tis [*Whatsoever ye, that I*] but not [*Whatsoever not ye, that I*] and consequently, this double affirmation of Christ may be perfectly true; Whosoever stands bound here, stands bound there; and whosoever are absolved here, are absolved there; and yet for all that, are many bound in Heaven which are not bound in the Church, & loosed in Heaven which are not absolved by the Church. And if the phrase used in Saint John, [*whatsoever ye retained, it is retained*] seem to any to have an exclusive sense, thus, that what we absolve not here, we do retain; and consequently, that whom we absolve not, God will not absolve. I answer, that this is a mistake, arising from the equivocalnesse of the word [*retain*] which in the Greek *ῥητιω* (as we shewed) signifies no more in this place then *to*, or binding in the other Gospels; in which, because that intimates not any exclusive power, neither will it be reasonable that this shall. And so much for the fourth particular also.

To which, before we part from it, it will not perhaps be unseasonable (though I hope I shall not be obliged to justify the truth of the relations) to annex a passage or two out of the latter stories of the Greek Church, (believed generally by them, & mentioned on affirmation of particular knowledge by some which have come from them to this place, & lived amongst us) which will acquaint us with the awe, and signify the opinion which it seems they have of the real efficacie of these censures of the Church. It is related (saith Crucius in *Turco-græcia*) in the Constantinopolitan histories, that the Sultan Mahomet among other things concerning the Christian Religion, asked the Patriarch Maximus, *ἡ πειρὴ τῶ ἀποκριῶν* concerning Excommuni-

tion of which he had heard *ὅτι ὃν ἀν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ χριστιανῶν ἀποεῖσαν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ διαλύει* ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ φαίνεται ὅτι τις τὰς ἀποεῖσιν ἀνέωχθῇ, ὡς τύμπανον καὶ μέλας. That if the high Priests, and Priests of the Christians should excommunicate any person upon just cause, the body of that man dissolves not into the earth, but remains entire and whole; and when the sepulchre of any such is opened, they appear like drums or timbrels, and black, i. e. the body swell'd, but whole, and withal much discoloured : And that upon absolution the body is dissolved to dust. In the truth of which tradition the Sultan desired to be confirmed by the Patriarch, who upon search made, found (saith he) that a certain loose woman having defamed a former Patriarch, Genadius Scholarius, was by him excommunicate, and so dyed. *Ἡ δὲ Σηπὺλχρε* Maximus caused to be opened, and (*ὡς θαυμασίον θεῶν*, O the wonders of God, saith he) *ἐνέβη ὡς ἐνέβη, ἐξ ὀγκωμένης καὶ μύρονος, καὶ μέλας*, She was found as she was at the time of her buriall, only swell'd and black. This (saith he) was certified to the Sultan, who sent some of his Nobles to view it, which they did with admiration, and caused the corps to be sealed up in a Coffin with the Imperial Seal, and returned at a set day. Then the Patriarch opened it, and *ἐποίησε λειτουργίαν, καὶ ἀνέγνω εὐχὴν συν χυρηντικὴν*, officiated and read the prayer of absolution : Whereupon the joints of her hands and feet were immediately loosed. They sealed it up again, and returning after three dayes found all turn'd to dust. This they reported to the Sultan, who wondred, and was astonished, and said, *ὅτι θαυμασία, καὶ ἀληθὴς ἡ πίστις αὐτῶν*, That this Religion and faith of the Christians was wonderful and true. This same story is related again at large, l. 2. Turco Gr. s. 32. In the Patriarchial History of Emanuel Malaxus in vulgar Greek. A like example there is also of one Arsenius, who dyed excommunicate, l. 2. s. 43. p. 151. and also of Johanničius, a Pseudo-patriarch, l. 2. p. 156. of whom, saith he, *ἐνέβη ἀπὸ εἰσπύου τύμπανον* the excommunicate was found hard and swelled as a drum or timbrel. The truth of the passages, I hope it will not be expected of me to assert or confirm (nor can I any further then the fore-mentioned authority will bear) I shal rather give the reader my conjecture how this perswasion became so general, & these stories so confidently reported among them. It was, I suppose, from the observing, but not understanding in the Gospel the phrases of binding and

and loosing, which not knowing to what they belong'd (for the modern Grecians are far from being very learned) they may have applied them to the dissolving, or not dissolving of mens bodies in the earth, which they there expresse by διαλυτον, & ἀδιαλυτον, and αἰων, the word of the Evangelist. If this be not it, I have no more to say of it, but that it was a πάρεργον.

Sec. 6.

And now having taken this licence a little to expatiate, I shall enlarge my teather a little wider; and having said thus much of this custome of excommunication among Jews and Christians, proceed yet farther, *ex abundanti*, and by way of appendix, shew the consent of others, even of Heathen people in this matter, by that means (if not to confirm, as by an instance, that ancient truth of Clemens so oft repeated by him, *Ελληνες ἀπὸ κλήσεως*, The Grecians knowledge and solemn practices are generally stoln from the Jews, yet) to shew the opinion of other men, imbued with other principles of Theologie, by which the design of this former Treatise may with a rational man, who is not a Divine, be somewhat established, I shall instance but in two particulars (because it is but *ἔκ περισθῆ*, or as *ex abundanti*, that I say any thing of it.) The first, of the ancient Grecians, as I find it mentioned by *Diod. Siculus*. *Bibl. 16.* in the discourse of the *ἔργον πόλεμος*, the sacred Edit. *Rhodo-War* betwixt the *Phocenses* and *Lacedemonians* on one side, and *man p. 425.* the *Thebans*, &c. on the other; of which there is mention in *Thucydides*, but a full narration in *Diodorus Siculus* in the place *L. 1. p. 73.* fore-cited. From that one Author in one Page these few things *p. 425.* may be learnt by way of story. 1. That on occasion of sacriledge or invasion of the rights of their gods, (*ἡγομένους ἡ δὲ δὶδν*) as the plowing up a peice of sacred ground call'd *Cirrhea* (which was the crime of the *Phocenses*) or the taking in War, and seizing on the like place call'd *Cadmea* (which was the *Lacedemonians* fault) the Senate of the *Amphictyones* upon complaint of the *ἱεραρχήμορες* or recorders of holy things, did devote or Anathematize even a whole Country or Region at once, as that of the *Lacedemonians*, and that other of the *Phocenses*. 2. That what was thus done, was confirm'd by the Grecians generally, *καὶ ὅτι Ἑλλήνων συνεπικουρέων τὰ νόγματα τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων, &c.* 3. That though *Sacriledge* was the occasion of this devoting, yet was it not the immediate cause or crime wherein it was founded, but their not

submitting to some former punishments, not paying the *multis* which had been inflicted on them by the same Judges for that crime. The punishments of those first crimes are there mentioned to have been great summes of money laid on the offenders, (*καθιδίκασαν αὐτοὺς πολλοῖς χρεμάσιν, & πολλοῖς ταλάνοις καθεικθῆσαν*) and upon the not paying of that, this *devoting* follows. 4. The nature of this punishment consisted, 1. In the shame that it brought upon the offenders, such as *Philomelus* tells his *Phocenses*, *ἀνάνδρων ὑπάρχει πειρασθῆναι*, 'tis the part of wimandy persons not to lay it to heart, or consider it. 2. In the consequents of it, in that it would *κίνδυνον ἐπιφέρειν* & *τὴν ἑσπέραν πάντων εἰς ἀνατροπὴν*, bring danger and subversion to all their lives, & that in two respects. 1. In respect of God, to whose vengeance they were thus devoted, (answerable to the *μαρτυρία* formentioned, added to the *ἀνάθεμα*) in which respect it is, in order to the *Phocenses*, called there *καθιερωθεῖς*, being consecrated or devoted. 2. In respect of men, to whose mischief also they were exposed, (parallel to what we read of *Cain* when he was cast out of Gods presence; *Any man*, saith he, *that meets me, will kill me*) and therefore in order to the *Spartans*, it is call'd there *μισοπορνείας ἀξιώθεῖς*, an exposing them to the common hatred of all men. 5. That for them that were under any such sentence, there was no way, but to obey the *multis* that was formerly inflicted on them, i.e. to reform their *contumacie*, which they that were not able to do, or not willing, and therefore pretend they were not able (*διδάσκων ὥς ἐκίσει μὲν ἡ δύναμις τὰ χρέματα διὰ τὸ μέγεθος ἢ κατὰ δίκην*) have no way left, but endeavour to null the sentence, by proving it unjust, (*ἀκυρον κείσιν ποιεῖν, κείσεις ἀδίκους δεικνύσαι, ἀδίκους ἀποφάσεις ἀκυρῶσαι*) by shewing that it was no fault, on which the former punishment, (to which their *contumacie* had been exprest) was inflicted. And to make good this plea, their best & indeed only way was that of force, viz. to make *Philomelus* their General, & to provide him an Army, which was accordingly done, and after some three or four prosperous fights on that side, the conclusion was, that at last agreeably to the cause, in the sight of his prosperous impiety he was routed and slain. And so you have a brief of the first passage. The other is that known one of the *Druids* among the ancient *Galls*, mentioned by *Cæsar de Bell. Gall.* 6. the summe of it is this. Among the

Galls two onely sorts of men there are, saith he, *qui in aliquo sunt numero & honore, which are of account and honour among them, The Druids, and the Equites, or Noblemen, all the rest being pe-  
 xants and slaves. The former of these are thus described, by  
 their offices or employments, Illi rebus divinis intersunt, sacrificia  
 publica & privata procurant, religiones interpretantur, ad hos magnus  
 adolescentium numerus disciplinæ causâ concurrat, magnâque ii sunt  
 apud eos honore; nam fere de omnibus controversiis publicis privatisq;  
 constituunt, & si quid est admissum facinus, si cædes factâ, de heredi-  
 tate, de finibus controversia est, iidem decernunt, præmia pœnaq; con-  
 stituunt: Si quis aut privatus, aut populus, eorum decreto non steterit,  
 sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc pœna apud eos est gravissima; Quibus ita  
 est interdictum, ii numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur, ab iis  
 omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemq; defugunt, ne quid ex con-  
 tagione incommodi accipiant, neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque  
 ullus honos communicatur. His omnibus Druidibus præest unus, &c.  
 They are the men employed in all the service of God, perform the pub-  
 like and private sacrifices, instruct the youth, and are honoured by them,  
 are the Judges in wel-nigh all both publique and private controversies;  
 if any outrage or murder be committed, any difficulty about bounds or  
 inheritance, they decree and determine both rewards and punishments;  
 If any private person or people stand not to their decrees, they forbid  
 him their sacrifices. This is of all other the most grievous punishment,  
 they that are under this interdict, are accounted as impious and enor-  
 mous persons, all men refuse their company, come not neer them, nor  
 discourse with them, lest the contagion hurt them; they receive no ad-  
 vantage by the Lawes of the Kingdom, nor are capable of any honour  
 in it. Of all these Druids there is one Prefect or President, &c.  
 And it seems this custome and institution among them was  
 conceived to have had its original from Britain. Disciplina in  
 Britannia reperta, atque inde in Galliam translata esse existimatur, &  
 nunc qui diligentius eam rem cognoscere volunt, plerunq; illud discendi  
 causâ proficiuntur. This discipline was found in Britain, and thence  
 brought unto the Galls, and they that are willing to have any exact  
 knowledge of it, do now ordinarily go thither to learn it. The story  
 being in it self thus clear and full, will have little need of my  
 comment or observation on it; all that I meant to do was to  
 shew you the consent of other Religions, & Nations, and by that to  
 con-*



conclude, that the *beatens* thought not that unreasonable, which now *Christ* hath by standing-law establish't in his *Church*, and many that are called *Christians*, are so willing to cast out of it. And so much so this *prophecy* or also.

## CAP. VII.

Sect. I.

\*Vindic. of  
Lit.

AND now by way of conclusion of this whole discourse, I shall add somewhat of the utility of this peice of discipline, it with another preparatory to it, it might by the Governours of every *Church* be carefully exercised: That other preparative which I mean, is that, if not *Apostolical*, yet *Ecclesiastical* institution of *Confirmation*. The intention of which, and design of our *Church* in it, every man sufficiently knows (although it have been much and with very ill consequence of late neglected) and therefore I shall not here insist on it; and besides it hath been set down at large in \* another Discourse. This whole office of *Confirmation*, and the necessary preparatives of it, that of the *Ministers Catechising* (and thoroughly instructing all the youth of both sexes, and of all sorts within his cure, and explaining to the understanding of each, and laying home to his heart all the duties undertaken in his *Baptisme*) being solemnly premised, according to the rules and intention of our *Church*, and all duties perform'd and observed by the *Curate*, the *Child*, and the *Bishop* (and none permitted to come to the *Lords Table* that hath not laudably past through this course) would (in the opinion of a *goldy* and *learned* man, who did much study the ways of advancing *piety* and *learning*) tend most probably to the keeping men at least within bounds of *Christian civility*, from falling into enormous sins, which they had in their own persons so solemnly vow'd against. And therefore the use of that discipline, were extremely to be wish't for, that it were revived in each *Christian Common-wealth*: And if it should be objected, that having been so long neglected in this, it cannot now possibly be recovered again, because of the vast number of those that have been either not at all, or else but *formally*, and *perfunctorily*, or without precedent preparation confirm'd: I answer, that that argument proves not the impossibility, but

but only difficulty of doing it; or if the difficulty be so great, as to advance into a kinde of moral impossibility, yet ought it not therefore to be left *unattempted*; (we are required to *endeavour* the doing of things which appear morally impossible to be done; because God may enable us to do that, which, till we try, we conceive impossible; and though the not performing may not be damning, yet the not endeavouring may) or if still the difficulty of an universal reformation in this kind, discourage even from attempting it, yet may it be reasonable and feasible for every Pastour, now to begin with all the youth of his Parish, which have not yet come to the Lords Supper, and keep them to this probation; and so for ever hereafter constantly to continue; and then, though the elder sort of this present age come not under this method, nor consequently this means of reformation; yet perhaps the example of, and instructions bestowed on those under them, may work somewhat on them: and howsoever the stock of the succeeding age will now be wrought on, and so Pockery be mended; though the present age cannot, which to every good Christian will be worth considering. This course being thus taken for the planting, and rooting all good resolutions, and obtaining the blessing of God, upon the young and tender, (by the prayers of the Church, and the purport of Christs promise of *habent dabitur*) together with the use of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and attention to reading, and preaching of the Word, might very probably hope to be successfull; but then because possibly it may not, (some Christians will be *perjur'd* and *impudent*, rather then be chaste and conscientious, after all this) therefore comes in the use and utility of the censures of the Church, as a *Tabula post naufragium*, a means of bringing him to repentance, that by the former means could not be kept innocent; of reducing him by the rod, that the crook could not keep from straying. And if 'twere thus used, if every one that sel after confirmation, were first admonish'd by one, then if it served not, by two or three, and then upon refractariness, or indulgence in sin, deliver'd up to Satan, turn'd out of all Christian Communion without any partiality, or respect of persons, this would be as propable a means as

the wit of man could invent, either by the fear and expectation of this *censure* to deter them, and prevent those enormities that are now so ordinary among Christians, or else by *shame*, and other consequent *inconveniences*, as by *Causicks* to work the cure. For it cannot but be observed, what force *shame*, and *credit* have on the minds of men. A sin that is gotten into some countenance or reputation, though it be defective of all other loveliness or ability to tempt any, doth yet carry all before it without resistance; the fear of *shame* makes men *vicious*, that otherwise are not inclined to it, and certainly the same means would be able to commend *virtue* to us: there is not that infinite natural averfation against all *goodnes* in the minds of men (unless as that word signifies the *passions*, or carnal affections) as that men would be very wicked to lose by it; *afflictio dabit intellectum*, and such *afflictions* as these that fall upon the same, are not the most easily supportable, and therefore may possibly help even a *sensual* man to some *understanding*; and though the certain truth of this observation cannot otherwise be proved, but by our *resolution* to make *experience* of it, yet seems it to me to have the *Authority* and *Testimony* of Saint Paul himself in these words, (though usually, by those that are led by the sound of them, otherwise applyed) 2 Cor. 10. 4. *the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, (or to God, or (by an hebraisme very ordinary) very or exceeding mighty) to the pulling down of strong holds, &c.* which words that they belong to the point in hand, will 1. be probable by the *Context*, where the Apostle speaks of proceeding against *offenders*, which he calls *ἁγῶν ἡς ὑμῶν*, *bring bold towards them*, v. 1. 2. and *ἐκδικαίω ὑμῶν*, *to revenge or punish disobedience*, v. 6. and this according to the *ἐξουσία* or *authority* which the Lord had given him for *edification* or *instruction*, and not for *destruction* (which before I shewed you belong'd unto the power of *censure*) & then he adds a caution to remove a prejudice, that unreformed sinners had against him; his letters were severe, and so he, when he was absent; but far from all such *severity*, when he came amongst them; *καὶ περὶ πάντων ἐστὶν ὑμῖν*; *vile or tame, or unconsiderable*, when he was among them, i.e. that he threatned to *excommunicate*, but when

he

he came would not do it, which he calls *ἐπιτομία* *ἐπιτομία*, *ἐπιτομία*, terrifying by letters, v. 9. and *ἐπιτομία* *ἐπιτομία*, weighty or powerful letters, v. 10. i. e. severe and terrifying, which yet he threatens shall be equalled by his actions, when he comes among them, ver. 11. and so all along you see the business is about censures. And then 2. this sense of the words will be more then probable, by weighing the words themselves, wherein *ἐπιτομία* signifies confessedly the Apostles Ministry, as it doth so in the onely other place, where 'tis used in the New Testament, 1 Tim. 1. 18. That thou mightest war a good warfare, i. e. discharge the duty of thy Ministry, as thou oughtest, according to the importance of the Hebrew *מלחמה*, which is sometimes rendred *seculia*, warfare, sometimes *אמנות* Ministry [then *ἐπιτομία* *ἐπιτομία*, the weapons of that warfare] are the means to discharge that duty in the Ministry, of which nature though there be many more, preaching, catechizing, administration of Sacraments confirmation, &c. yet the context, or antecedents, and consequents of this place belonging, as was shew'd to the business of censures, will restrain it in this place peculiarly to those. Then, that these are not [*σαρκιν*, carnal] signifies that they are not weak, for so *ὀδὴ* at every turn in these Epistles signifies weakness, (and from thence oftentimes the law, because it was so weak, so unable to give strength to any disciple of Moses to perform it, as in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians 'tis insisted on) and so to omit more places of Testimony, in the next precedent verse, though we walk in the flesh, i. e. though we are weak, as men, and have no power over you, yet as Ministers, we are not, our Ministry is with power, and therefore it follows, as an explication of [*ἐπιτομία*, not carnal] but *ἐπιτομία* *ἐπιτομία*, mighty, or powerful, through, or to God, or exceeding powerful. And wherein doth this mightiness or power expresse it self? Why, *ἐπιτομία* *ἐπιτομία* *ἐπιτομία*, we render it, pulling down of strong holds, & so it may literally be rendred, as the end of excommunication, pulling down of all fortresses, that maintain or secure a man in sin; but more critically, the word *ἐπιτομία* signifies excommunication it self, both ver. 8. and Chap. 13. 10. and generally in the Canons of the Councils, and then *ἐπιτομία*, strong holds, may

signifie all impudent obstinate sinners, that will abbottherwise be wrought happily, and effectually, ver. 15. Every high thing, that exalteth it self, against the knowledge of God, i. e. against piety or Christianity; and so the words being thus interpreted in the retails, and then put together again in the grosse, will run thus: [The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds:] i. e. the censures of the Church are exceeding powerful, and that power consists in excommunicating pertinacious offenders. The truth of which observation, if not interpretation, will be undoubted to him that doth but remember, what this discourse hath so oft inculcated, that excommunication was delivering a man to Satan, and a consequent of that in those first times, corporal afflictions, diseases; (and sometime death it self) which, if any humane thing, would most probably work upon one. Onely it may be objected, that that consequent was peculiar to the Apostles times, and is not now in use, and consequently that a great part of the power of Ecclesiastical censures is now lost, and so now the weapons of our warfare may be carnal, our censures unsufficient to perform their task, to reduce impenitents, though theirs were not. To which I answer, by confessing the objection, that indeed it is so; and very reasonable it should, Christian Princes having now taken the tuition of the Church into their hands, and so those keen weapons in the spiritual hand not so necessary; as you know the *Manna* ceased to be rain'd from heaven, when the people were come into the promised land, flowing with milk and honey. Onely I shall then reply, that therefore it is more then fit, that some means should be used, in case of any discernable defect, to interpose by way of supply, and adde the more then moral persuasive power of some other fit engine beside that of the censures of the Church, especially in cases of enormous, infamous crimes, which may be done by the *Secular arm*; in such cases (when the Ecclesiastical censures perswade not) the impression of inflicting penalties, severe enough, as may be found expedient, *usque ad reformationem*, untill they make themselves capable (by testimonies of amendment) to receive release both from God and man; that so by that means, as God supplied the want



want of humane aid, by his extraordinary from heaven; and when the *Secular Magistrates* discharged not their duty, exercised not the power given them to the purging of the Church from rotten, vicious, prophane, incorrigible members, God gave this power to the *Apostles* of inflicting diseases on Malefactors; so now that extraordinary power being withdrawn from the Church, the Magistrate should think himself most strictly obliged to perform his duty, for which if it should be required, that we produce the expresse commands or directions of Christ and his Apostles, or Primitive presidents; I answer, That will be unjust to require of us, 1. Because in Scripture times, there were other means to supply that want, the Devils corporal inflictions on them that were delivered to him, and so any other might be spared: 2. Because this duty naturally belongs to the Magistrate, who alone hath ordinarily *ἀναγκαστικὴ δικαιοσύνη*, compulsive jurisdiction, which as it was practised by the Kings in the Old Testament, so was it not interdicted by Christ in the New, but all left in that matter by him as he found it; which being granted, it may be said, that as Christ or the Apostles give no directions for this, so they needed not to give any. 3. Because both then, and in the Primitive Church, the Secular power was not Christian, and therefore the assistance could not be expected from them, which now most reasonably may, to awake, and haze, and drive those that will not be allured and drawn, that so even in this world, there may be no peace, quiet rest, tranquillity, or security to the wicked.

Isa. 1. 15, 16, 17, 18. Wash yee, make you clean, &c.

T H E E N D.